

# The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XXI, No. 3. SEPTEMBER 1941

## THE EDUCATION OF THE PASTOR

### DEFINITION AND INTRODUCTION

(1) By the word education I mean the equation between self and circumstance. If a man is equal to his environment, if he masters his surroundings, he is then, to my thinking, an educated man. I know of no other definition of the word that is satisfactory. Our English word education lacks the precision of the same word in French, where it means rightly or suitably brought up. And the French do not confuse, as we are apt to do, the distinction between education and erudition.

If a peasant, for example, who does not know how to read or write, none the less knows perfectly well how to work on the land, and has a right sense of what is due to God and men, he is not then, to my thinking, an uneducated man. He is equal to his environment.

(2) An educated priest, therefore, is a priest who masters his surroundings, who is equal to that environment which the priesthood creates. In these notes I am not speaking in a general way of the priesthood, and of the environment which it creates. I am speaking in particular and exclusively of secular priests in England.

(3) In the course of these notes I often quote from the *Regula Pastoralis* of Gregory the Great (P. for part, and C. for chapter). For pastors of souls it is an incomparable work; incomparable in the combined serenity, amplitude, and balance of its principles.

(4) In these notes I make no attempt to cover the whole ground of clerical education. If I seem to confine myself to certain points and to omit others, it is not that I overrate or underrate the importance of anything. My whole reason for writing these notes is that after more than twenty-three years' experience and observation of pastoral life in England, it seems particularly useful to set down and emphasize the points which I select. I divide what I have to say into two parts.

### PART I

#### (a) *The Pastor Himself.*

(1) The first thing to be aimed at in the training of the seminarist, in my opinion, is to enable him to master that part of his environment which consists in the discovery and acceptance of that situation in life which comes to him by the will of God.

The pastor is one *qui prospera mundi postposuit* (P. I, C. X). On that

account he seeks to be in a place of God's choosing and not in a place of his own choice. To do this he should make it a rule from the very outset (for a bad beginning may never be corrected) to the end of his pastoral life not to ask, from human motives, for this or that curacy, this or that parish, this or that change of curate, this or that work. If, from a wish for a bigger parish, better church and house, ampler scope, easier domestic life, and the like, he makes various requests of his superiors, he is then unequal to his environment in this fundamental respect.

It is a point which, in my opinion, can never be too much impressed upon the seminarist. If not the letter, the whole spirit of obedience (and the blessing that goes with obedience) is involved in this. I see no way by which the care of souls and the human wishes of a pastor can be reconciled. As Archbishop Ullathorne says in his *Autobiography*, the care of souls is an office so far beyond human power that nothing can make it safe or effective but the grace attached to obedience.

(2) The seminarist should be left in no doubt but that fidelity to this choice of God will demand great self-sacrifice and bring a heavy cross. It may even amount to a sort of martyrdom at times. But even then it is not extraordinary; it is ordinary. I am using the word ordinary in its deepest sense of coming from Holy Orders. Far above the faithful who assist at Mass, the priest, who is the instrument of God in offering it, should mean what he appears to mean in offering sacrifice, by dying daily with Our Lord at Mass.

If a pastor cannot make this sacrifice of self he is then unequal to his environment, for he should be one *qui nulla adversa pertimescit* (ibid.). If he does, however, make this sacrifice, he will have a hundredfold in this life, as he learns throughout his life that the greatness or size of one's life is not in circumstance but in character, not in the external honour of the world, but in the internal profit of the spirit. The pastor is one *qui sola interna desiderat* (ibid.).

(3) The seminarist should be warned of the danger of self-deception in this matter. It is very easy for the pastor who has really got his own way to believe that the zest which then comes to him is priestly zeal. The warning of Gregory should be well known to the seminarist: *quod scilicet sollicitus rector debet, quia plerumque vitia virtutes se esse mentiuntur* (P. 2, C. IX).

(b) *The Relations between Pastor and People.*

(1) The shepherd (I mean the literal shepherd) does not involve himself emotionally with the sheep. He is not personally offended by or angry or impatient with the sheep; he is not cynical, curious, unfair, depressed or elated where they are concerned. So too should it be with the pastor in his relations with the flock. Things that are sins in anyone can be not only sinful in the pastor, but a contradiction of the pastoral life. The people know this. For if a priest were to be offended, impatient, or angry in a

purely human way; if he made a cynical comment about anyone; if he were to pry into things that do not concern him (like an unpleasant type of policeman); if he were quite unfair; if he were depressed when people say anything against him and jubilant when the reverse happened; or anything of the kind, the people would then say, "I never thought priests were like that". When people say so much they are already greatly disedified. So it would be of the greatest utility to impress this Gregorian principle upon our seminarists: *Tantum debet actionem populi actio transcendere praesulis, quantum distare solet a grege vita pastoris* (P. 1, C. I).

(2) The whole demeanour of the pastor should be such that he impresses the people as a man of prayer in his own life and yet most approachable and gentle where they are concerned. The prayer of the priest is the greatest possible protection against all those too-human things which I mentioned in the previous section. It gives the priest a sort of aloofness which the people love, for it is accompanied by a gentleness which invites in the most irresistible way the imparting of their confidence—upon which imparting the very salvation of their souls may depend. All this is exquisitely dealt with by Gregory (P. 2, C. V): *Sit rector singulis compassione proximus, prae cunctis contemplatione suspensus*. The life of the pastor reaches from one extremity to another. There is no one so far from and so near to people as himself. As far as I know there is no need to think that seminarists could ever go through their training without learning this. But I would often remind them that the preservation of this truly pastoral attitude requires life-long vigilance and perseverance. It is so sad to see the bloom wear off.

(3) The behaviour of the pastor should be such that good people find him very friendly and attentive and that those who are not good find him a person whom they must very much respect. It is easy enough, as the seminarist might well be told, to slip into opposite ways. For instance, one can easily slip into the habit of taking far too little notice of good people, just taking them for granted, and on the other hand allowing oneself to get far too tolerant of those who are not good. *Sit rector bene agentibus per humilitatem socius, contra delinquentium vitia per zelum justitiae erectus* (P. 2, C. VI).

Not indeed that the whole art of the care of souls consists in being lenient with the good and strict with the others. Discretion often demands that one should not be invariably lenient with the good, and charity often demands the utmost tenderness and sympathy with the bad. In all these matters the pastor, who should have the strength of mind of a man, should also have the tenderness of a woman. *Curandum quippe est, ut rectorem subditis et matrem pietas, et patrem exhibeat disciplina* (ibid.). Indeed, deep reflection and calm judgement are necessary if one would ultimately know *quae esse debet rectoris discretio correptionis et dissimulationis, fervoris et mansuetudinis* (P. 2, C. XI).

(4) The seminarist will readily understand the meaning of Gregory's

*sit rector interiorum curam in exteriorum occupatione non minuens, exteriorum providentiam in interiorum sollicitudine non relinquens* (P. 2, C. VII). But it will be well to warn him that he may often be tempted in his pastoral life to curtail the spiritual things for the sake of the temporal things (in themselves of course necessary). His years in the seminary are for his spiritual formation; he must never hope to be, nor is there the slightest need he should be, as proficient in business matters as a business man. It is the priest who excels in the care of souls rather than the priest who excels in business matters who shows the true profit of his seminary days. The primacy of the spiritual should ever be before his mind: and all care should be taken to forestall in the seminarist a tendency that may easily develop afterwards: the tendency to judge the amount of work a pastor does by the money he has collected, the building he has erected, and suchlike. For the words of Gregory, *a subditis ergo inferiora gerenda sunt, a rectoribus summa cogitanda, ut scilicet oculum qui praevidendis gressibus praeeminet, cura pulveris non obscureret* (ibid.), apply not merely to the hierarchy that is in the Church, but to the hierarchy that is in the duties of a pastor.

(5) When Gregory says, *ne placere rector suo studio hominibus appetat* (P. 2, C. VIII), he does not fail to add, with his customary perfection of balance, *sed tamen ad quod placere debeat, intendat*. It would indeed be the greatest pity if the seminarist were one day to become a pastor who was too anxious to please men and too little concerned in pleasing God, but it is the second part of this principle (that the pastor should strive to please men in the things in which he ought to please them) that I would speak of here.

Let me give two surpassing extracts from the last lines of this Chapter VIII, Part 2: *difficile quippe est, ut quamlibet recta denuncians praedicator, qui non diligitur, libenter audiat*. And again, *quod bene Paulus insinuat cum sui nobis studii occulta manifestat dicens: "sicut et ego per omnia omnibus placeo". Qui tamen rursus dicit: "Si adhuc hominibus placerem, Christi servus non essem". Placet ergo Paulus, et non placet: qui in eo, quod placere appetit, non se, sed per se hominibus placere veritatem quaerit*.

Now, one of the first of all means by which the pastor pleases men, in the way in which he ought to please them, is by his good manners. To be equal to his environment, to be educated, in this respect, his manners should cover and allow for all the susceptibilities of those with whom he comes in contact; it should extend to all grades of society. I think it well to go into details here, and I will take first his manners in relation to his fellow-priests.

In his relation with his fellow-priests he should know, according to his position, how to give and how to receive correction. Towards his superiors he should adopt that method he learnt in the seminary of anticipating correction by self-accusation. Could it not be explained to seminarists that this practice is not just for the convenience of the seminary, but for the grace of all his priestly life? It would be an unmannerly



proceeding to wait for correction (from one who in any case does not care to give it), and when given it to adopt perpetually a defensive, and even a contemptuous and ungentle, attitude.

Again, since pastors are called to be the very presidents of life, the standard of behaviour in the Presbytery should equal that of the gentlest and best-mannered people. It would be against the very nature of their exalted calling if pastors were content with rough manners in the Presbytery. Worse still would it be if the pastors had something like indifference to or contempt of gentle ways. Gentle manners in the members of the staffs of seminaries are an immense help to all our future priests. For good manners are a subtle thing, and are more picked up than deliberately learnt, so that example counts for much. Needless to say, I am not speaking of any softness, cheapness, vincer, or snobbery. Good manners are this: that a man, who is always himself and always perfectly natural and simple, has a due appreciation of and consideration for the susceptibilities of all men.

I say, of all men. For if the pastor has a standard of manners that is acceptable to less than all he fails to master a portion of his environment. To secure such mastery it is necessary, and enough, if his manners are perfectly acceptable to cultured gentle folk; for then, *sicut minor in maiore*, all other people will find his manners acceptable to them.

The well-mannered pastor will naturally orientate his life as cultured people do. Because he is a pastor he will be characterized by love for and interest in the poor. But, once again because he is a pastor, his education will protect him from seeking his own pleasure or recreation with the poor. If he did so, he would place himself in a false position, he would alienate the cultured, and he would spoil the poor.

He would place himself in a false position. Continual social association with the uncultured develops tendencies in the pastor which lessen his power to control environment. He adopts their inadequate point of view, and he develops mannerisms, habits of speech, and a set of interests that unfit him for association and conversation with cultured people. He feels out of place with them and they with him, and thus control is lost.

Indeed, he then alienates such people. His demeanour in and out of church displays a crudeness they dislike. They are conscious that he is indifferent to the necessary distinctions that are made in social life, and that he is partly on the defensive against, and subtly on the offensive towards, people like themselves. There may also be occurrences which can nowise be excused; as when cultured people are aware that the pastor, who rarely meets and usually avoids them, spends hours in the kitchens and the company of uncultured people whom they themselves employ.

He then also spoils the poor in all sorts of ways. Here are some of them. Sharing what I would call the scullery point of view, he allows them to say things in his presence which they should not say: intimate details about the family life of the cultured, unbecoming gossip, and the like.

By tolerating these things he undermines that due sense of subjection which St. Paul desired to see in the various grades of life. Again, he causes jealousy. If a pastor were to visit, for social purposes and rarely, a cultured family uniquely distinguished, not just by position, but above all by piety, then no one is jealous. But if he frequently visits a family in a poor quarter (lives in the house, as the saying goes) and fails to visit other families in the same street perhaps, then much jealousy is caused. It is also possible that such particularizing with the poor may be very indiscreet.

Without wishing to be unduly long, there are several little examples of good manners which I would give. Let my experience and observation be my excuse for seeming to delay. It would, I think, be well often and tactfully to put little admonitions like these before the seminarist: not to use slang in conversation; not to boast; not to develop a habit of contradicting; not to be boisterous or noisy, especially when wearing cassock and cotta, when attending funerals, and when eating in public; not to smoke in the streets of the parish or in the precincts of the church; to give and to return salutes in the manner of well-bred people; to know when and how to call on and when and how to take leave of people; not to touch people except to shake hands; not to delay in conversation with girls or young women in public; not to be ill-humoured in the pulpit, nor to be emotional on the subject of money; to be very sensitive for others' feelings and not over-sensitive oneself; to know the little graces of life and the small apologies, as when opening correspondence in the presence of others, or when unavoidably arriving late at table; not to converse with but always to have great consideration for the servants in the Presbytery; to keep oneself very clean, especially one's hands; etc., etc. In a word, to please in all the ways in which one ought to please.

To keep the best wine for the last, however, I would say that fidelity to rubrics and a right sensibility in church are the most agreeable of all good manners. Even after many years' experience, every year that passes increases my conviction that people are more influenced by the way the priest says Mass than by any other single thing. Rubrics seem to me a sacred form of manners, and it will mean much good to souls if the seminarists are told and told again that all through their priestly life, familiarity with the rubrics of the Mass must breed respect. To aim in a perfectly natural and not of course a rigid way at the utmost perfection of word and movement in the Mass is both an immense source of edification to the people and a great comfort for the priest. Comforting especially if he have nothing all his life but Low Mass to say, and is nostalgic always for High Ceremony—a severe nostalgia too it is. I have read the expression somewhere, the dry bones of Low Mass. A sad misnomer. Dry bones, indeed! when this little bit of Liturgy, which may be all we have, has all the slenderness and grace of the wild flowers of the field.

It is also very important, I consider, to impress upon the seminarist the need of sensibility in church. When the loud voice of the Mass is too

loud, or when private devotion is blatantly revealed at Mass, we have, I think, a want of sacred manners which disturbs. Again, when preaching or catechizing, the pastor should be most sensitive to the susceptibilities of his people; he should be like thistle-down that feels the lightest air. English congregations are particularly sensitive to voice, good taste, and so forth.

Before concluding this section on the pastor I should like to say, merely as an expression of my opinion, that I think it would bring great benefit if the *Regula Pastoralis* were in greater use. I should be happy to think its use was begun in the seminary, not as a task for the students, but as a pleasant interlude from time to time, in the form of a lecture or explanation by a superior. In this way the seminarist would be introduced to a work which he could use throughout his pastoral life, a work with which, apart from the Sacred Scriptures, there is nothing to compare where pastors are concerned. Pastors who believe that it is hard to meditate would find a God-send (indeed) in this work. It is intensely interesting, since its subject matter is their very state in life. And yet its quality obliges one to take it very slowly as one should take a book for meditation. Its Latin is not always easy, for which reason, too, it would be well to grow accustomed to it in the seminary.

Growing accustomed to it, let the seminarist, while profiting from its sacred quality, not fail to be attracted by its other qualities as well. The *Regula* is itself an apt illustration of the art of pleasing men that men may learn to please God. It has a typical patristic quality which I can but describe as matutinal. Pre-dating hordes of heresies, it has that freedom from theological self-consciousness which belongs to ancient writing and to ancient prayer. It has the freshness and the aura of the dayspring.

It has, moreover, that plenitude of grace and nature such as one finds in so many of the hymns recited daily in our Office. Witness, for example, all those *Quomodo admonendi* sections which reveal such understanding of the diversity of human hearts. There is something particularly pleasing, and once again typically patristic, in this harmony of majestic thought and human understanding. Certainly, the lessons which it teaches, with such serenity, amplitude, and balance, are not the less acceptable because we needs must pause at times for the luxury of a gradual and sidelong smile.

## \* PART 2

(1) THERE are two stages in the formation of the minds of seminarists. The first stage is their human studies, and the second part their sacred sciences. It is of their human studies that I write in this section of my notes.

(2) If the first stage, the human studies, is well done, the future pastor will then be able to use his sacred science for the benefit of the people, he

will feed them with it. If they are badly done, the future pastor, no matter how excellent be his course of sacred study, will be unable to use the sacred knowledge thus acquired for the feeding of the flock.

(3) The reason for this is that a step will be missing in his mind; there will be a gap he cannot bridge. For the formation of the mind must be gradual, by steps or *gradus*. Take this simple illustration: it can and does happen that a man who is a sound theologian, but whose human studies have been poorly done, will regularly take his sermons and catechisms ready-made from books and thus fail to use his sacred science precisely where and when it should be used. On the other hand, a man who, owing to late vocation (as with Newman) or to lay vocation (as with Chesterton), may not be an expert theologian, will none the less make immense beneficial use of what he knows because of a distinguished culture of a human kind.

(4) The great function of human studies in the pastor's life is that they create proximity between sacred science and the common interest of men. There is no gap, nothing missing in the mind. For human culture is a Jacob's Ladder between the people and the priest. *Trabit sua quemque voluptas*, says Augustine, wishing to narrate the attraction of the Truth, and every Roman face looks up with interest to hear its poet quoted, just as every Roman ear is charmed by Augustine's high felicity of style.

(5) This proximity of sacred science and human interest reaches its highest point when one sees the whole of common life as a similitude of the truth one wants to teach, of the new thing one wants to say. In profane as well as sacred ways many have excelled in this; our vivid, lovely Shakespeare, and the rest. But the pinnacle of this art is Our Lord Himself, who sees the entire range of human interest as a picture of His Word—the Kingdom of Heaven is *like* this or that. I am not saying that we can make all our seminarists excel in this way. But there is no reason why, as a result of sound Humanities, they should not be equipped to teach, or should be unfamiliar with that art whereby the proficient in human studies conduct the ignorant to knowledge with all the assurance and the sympathy of people holding hands.

(6) The chief factor in this human formation of the seminarist is no doubt the study of English, the study of his own vernacular; wherein both the language and the mind of England may be found. Acquaintance with the English mind will equip the pastor with an endearing method of approach. He will show (if he has the culture he cannot but show) that he both loves and inhabits what is excellent in English thought. Acquaintance with the English language will provide him with that thing called style. Style has been many times defined. It is, I suppose, ultimately undefinable except by its possessor's name. Milton's style is elevated indeed, just as Belloc's style is lucid. But the fulness of definition is that Milton's style is just Miltonic, and Belloc's style Bellocian, for no one has improved on Boileau's definition.

The pastor's style, then, is simply the way this particular priest *succeeds* in saying what he knows and wants to say. But the pastor is before all else a teacher, and will naturally tend to those figures of speech whereby, more than by any other means, the ignorant are led to knowledge. I refer above all to the simile and metaphor; to those figures, in a word, which show that a man sees common life as a similitude of what he wants to say. On this point my meaning must not be taken in an arid way. Anyone can deliberately think out a simile or two to be introduced into a catechetical instruction, and so far so good. But I refer rather to that human culture that brings similes without effort to the mind; to the culture that makes the mind instinctively comparative.

In our junior seminaries we must make the students love their English class above all other profane studies. Too much trouble could never be taken to secure the right professor for this task. He must be one who can teach them how to write; how to enrich their minds by reading, and how, enriched by reading, but fostering originality, to use language as the means for the communication of their thoughts. Without training, human beings know much more than they are able to communicate in words; for the proficiency that comes by nature without training does not exceed the commonplace necessities and routine interests of life.

(7) It might seem that proficiency in the vernacular is the whole secret of the culture I desire. I think it is very likely the chief part of the secret, but I am sure the whole secret is not there. I think that the culture I desire comes from a general contact with all our civilized inheritance. I am simply arguing from fact, against which no argument is valid. For instance, it is a fact that men who have not read English, but perhaps Classics, or History, or Law at Oxford, often write delightful English prose.

The thing I would aim at, therefore, is not just proficiency in the vernacular (the future priest must in any case give much time to other subjects). Let us just try to give him a formation of a general kind, but English in its character and emphasis. To put it briefly, he should be one who belongs to English culture. All this, of course, has nothing to do with the seminarist's race or nationality. I would just make him cultured in an English way even if he came from Kipalapala. We are concerned only for his education for the pastor's life in England.

Human culture, however, is not merely the acquisition of knowledge but the development of taste. The conversion of England is delayed by bad taste in the decoration of our churches. I have known converts suffer in their bones, so to speak, from this, and it should be so unnecessary to impose that fracture on them. Life-long Catholics suffer naturally, too, if they have good taste, but they are usually more easygoing, and more readily content to worship where Our Lord does not refuse to come.

Having the right tastes, our students should also learn how to appreciate, if not to practise, art. If students leave the seminaries with something like indifference to—or, worse still, with something like contempt of—art,

they will lack a part of education, and thereby fail to control a portion of environment; no little part in a country with a civility as old as ours.

Let us not forget, it is as an artist that man by nature (I am not speaking here of grace) is most like His Creator. Fine art is called fine (to distinguish it from servile art) because its value comes so mightily from mind and so slenderly from matter. What intrinsic value is there in the canvas and paint in Velasquez's portrait of Innocent X, compared with the value, inexpressible in terms of cash, that comes to it from that great artist's mind? Yet even the great artist must employ some part of pre-existing matter, however little. God, then, alone is Artist, for He makes out of nothing. But it remains true that it is when men make marvellously from little matter that they by nature come most near to, albeit always infinitely remote from, God's creative act.

If the Church, resisting Manichean error, defends the ontological goodness that is in all that is, if our philosophy asserts that *omne ens est bonum*, how deficient must be the human culture of the priest who is devoid of appreciation of the first works of human beings, the achievement of fine art! Remember how the Church herself has employed art throughout her whole majestic history, and how her very existence provides the highest invitation and the noblest dedication any art can have. Let us bear in mind too that with the Reformation so-called the Anglicans kept everything except the Faith, and that we lost everything except the Faith. As a result, those of the false faith, in possession of our glorious monuments, find more inspiration for the arts and taste. Their churches are quite commonly in good taste and with good art, and ours are too often the reverse. In a country where an aura of high human culture hangs around a false established religion, it will be well for pastors, if they would control an important portion of environment, to be no strangers to the arts. Remember, too, it is a country with a high tradition in these things, and a country where the opportunities of making converts are numerous. Many of those who will approach us for conversion are full of sensibility on all that touches art and taste.

(8) It might seem from what I say that I suggest a standard of human culture higher than we can expect to have among our seminarists, given the restrictions under which we work. These restrictions are many, and better known to others than to me. Our time is restricted, vocations are scarce, especially among young men from cultured homes, and the numbers from whom we can choose our seminary staffs are limited as well. It reminds me of the retort given by a Church of England clergyman to the lay critic who said things would be so much better if the clergy were more cultured men. The clergyman replied, "I agree; but what can we do? We have only the laity to choose from." In what I say about the human culture of our seminarists in these notes I am but stressing its importance. As for standard, we can but continue to make it our aim (and cultured people in control can do much with even limited material) to raise up priests

who are accepted in English life and regarded in English opinion as cultured human beings. I do think also that variety in the domestic sources of vocation is to be desired; that the contribution to the secular priesthood from our cultured Catholic homes should be in proportion to their numbers, and that we should have the opportunities of speaking on the secular priesthood to young men from such homes. One continually has a sense of something being lost when the pastors do not easily and naturally reflect and penetrate the whole of social life.

(9) While human culture extends control in many a direction, its chief purpose will always be to help the priest to catechize, to instruct in Christian Doctrine. His sacred study gives him what he has to teach, and the ability itself to teach will come to him through human studies; for, as we have seen, it is through human studies that he acquires the means for the communication of his thoughts. Naturally, care should also be taken with the student's voice, and he should be taught that elocution which consists in enabling him to speak in a distinct and pleasing way.

It is of high importance, indeed it is paramount, that no trouble should be spared to make our priests good catechists. It is not enough that they should know how to preach. Sermons, though of occasional value, are of slight value compared with catechizing. Again, while good preachers are not hard to come by, good catechists by comparison are very rare. Sermons are so much easier that one could give an excellent sermon vicariously by preaching someone else's stuff. But it is impossible to catechize well without giving something of oneself. Above all, that something should be spiritual—that goes without saying. But, to keep to my point here, one cannot truly catechize without some ability to say one's say in terms of that experience and interest which one shares in common with one's hearers.

It is not I but Pius X who tells us of the immensely greater importance and comparatively greater rarity of good catechizing, in his "Encyclical on The Teaching of Christian Doctrine", 15 April, 1905.

(10) This human culture of the priest, of great importance everywhere, is especially important in our country. Our own people find the tide of life against them all the time (not necessarily in any form of deliberate hostility), and they tend to fall away from attendance at the church. On that account they depend more on the human culture of the priest than people would where public life is Catholic. What experienced priest has not noticed how much Catholics in England are influenced by the human culture of the priest as distinct from the priesthood itself? We call it a fault, like the fault of only going to church because you like the parson. But, what would you? It is a fault we must regard with no small amount of patience, for it is, humanly speaking, bound to come with the religious situation of the country what it is.

This human culture is certainly not less important in a country where opportunities for making converts are so numerous and inspiring. To

take that opportunity to the full, to control this huge cantle of environment, we must be able to meet every need and answer every challenge.

These few notes are offered for what they are worth; offered almost without thinking of their worth. When one's days are passed in a country where, so it seems to me, the pastoral life provides unique interests and exhilarating opportunities, the mouth is apt to speak from the fulness of the heart. The situation of religion here touches high drama in these times, and I unite myself to those numerous priests up and down the land who must often think and say, as I now think and say: it is good for us to be here.

JOHN P. MURPHY.

T  
prob  
the  
year  
lead  
if th  
the  
thei  
Agar  
to p  
whic  
sion  
nov  
of th  
it fo  
dial  
exp  
got  
ness  
exp  
Fear  
Fear  
deni  
offer  
give  
outl  
com  
to s  
dang  
cont  
has  
7  
mate  
cont  
are  
thin  
as a  
in a  
is th



## SPIRITUAL EXERCISES OF A RATIONALIST

THE mystery of life is everybody's business. It is unreasonable of the philosopher, who is such by profession, to claim that he alone shall probe and expound the riddle of existence. For my own part I welcome the spate of books from laymen in philosophy and theology which in recent years have tried to deal with these fundamental problems. If their musings lead them to conclusions which are sound and orthodox, much is gained: if their conclusions are unsound and unorthodox, I know at least where the opponents of orthodoxy stand and with what arguments they support their false conclusions, and I feel that even in this case much is gained. Again, it seems to me that a direct treatment of these topics is far preferable to philosophical innuendoes, asides and digressions in scientific works which would be far better science if they left these philosophical excursions for direct and full treatment in separate writings. If the scientist, or novelist for that matter, has what he conceives to be a coherent explanation of the mysteries of life and death, he is not doing himself justice if he puts it forth only incidentally in the course of a scientific work or by incidental dialogue in a novel. When a writer has recourse to this scrappy method of expounding his views on life he cannot complain if we say that he has not got a full and coherent system to expound or that he is afraid of the weakness of his system or of his arguments becoming plain in an *ex professo* exposition. For these reasons we welcome Professor Ryle's little book, *Fears may be Liars*,<sup>1</sup> in which he sets forth his views on Death, Life, Pain, Fear, and allied topics. It is a direct statement of his tenets and of his denials, with reasons, usually medical, given for the former but rarely offered for the latter. Yet we welcome the booklet as a frank statement given by a medical scientist of considerable eminence which gives us an outlook on life and the problems of existence which we must presume is common to a large number of scientists. The book is written avowedly to strengthen and console people in the present tragic circumstances of danger, desolation, and sorrow. We may take it therefore that this book contains all that Professor Ryle has to offer in this direction and that he has enforced his views with all the arguments at his command.

The philosophies of pragmatic expediency and utilitarianism and of materialism are today so clearly bankrupt and incapable of making any contribution towards men's needs in the present crisis that their votaries are discreetly silent. But Professor Ryle, little as he has to offer, evidently thinks that it is his duty to contribute what he can. Evolutionary progress as a mystical and ethical ideal may seem to us barren and unsatisfying, but in a scientist of Professor Ryle's type not only is it a first principle, but it is the highest and only source of inspiration to which such as he can appeal.

<sup>1</sup>*Fears may be Liars*. By John A. Ryle, M.D., Regius Professor of Physic in the University of Cambridge, Consulting Physician to Guy's Hospital, (George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., London. Pp. 95. Small 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.)

Hence it is at the shrine of the biological process that, with such warmth as he can muster, he asks us to worship.

It is not surprising that doctors should feel impelled to philosophize on the mystery of life and of existence. Except the priest, no one comes as closely into contact with life and death and suffering in all its forms. It is not to be wondered at that he should feel an impatient and even angry irritation at the apparent impossibility of solving the riddle of existence, at the elusiveness of the problem of suffering and of evil, at the inadequacy of the solutions put forward. These difficulties are the material of his daily work and, especially when medical science and art prove impotent to relieve them, he feels the urgent necessity of a rational explanation of the baffling mystery of it all: in other words, he yearns to know the philosophy of it all. People like Professor Ryle irritably reject the Christian solution mainly because they do not know what it is. They have heard scraps of Christian teaching, but they reject these either because they have heard faulty versions of them or because they have not seen them as part of the whole or, finally, because lack of leisure and their own preconceived principles prevent them from granting Christian teaching an impartial hearing. On our side we ought sometimes to ask ourselves whether Catholics are doing their duty by such people, for even in the case of these we are our brother's keeper. Are not we sometimes to blame for their getting wrong or incomplete notions of Catholic teaching? Does the Catholic apologist and theologian seriously try to express himself in language that they can understand? Are we not sometimes too ready to scoff at what are real advances in knowledge? Do we sufficiently discourage superstitious and semi-superstitious practices and "devotions" and dubious revelations, all of which are a serious stumbling-block to honest non-Catholics and to many Catholics? These are some of the questions which we should put to ourselves in a serious examination of conscience.

Before proceeding to a criticism or appreciation of Professor Ryle's book, I will give a résumé of its contents.

**DEATH AND DYING.** Since death is oblivion, there need be no fear of death. In *sudden* danger of *dying* we know from experience that in fact there is neither suffering nor fear. In *illness* there is little or no suffering, for there is a dimming of consciousness at times of real or apparent suffering: in the category of the dying only a small proportion are fully conscious of their suffering. *Angor animi* (terror of dying) is not present in those who in fact are about to die.

**LIFE AND LIVING.** Know what is knowable *now* and do what ought to be done *now*. Soul=total personality=fully conscious personality. So the unborn babe has no soul but acquires one (which=personality) when it is born and sensations crowd upon it. The writer is unwilling to accept personal immortality. He accepts an ultimate Cause which he "cannot conceive to be anthropomorphic" and he admits "magnificent design". But "all this" does not necessitate heaven or an after-life: nor has belief

in these been wholly beneficent. Good living should imply the "optimum employment of limbs and senses and mind, and . . . reason". Life to the full and improvement for self and posterity—that and not to desire prolongation into eternity—is really living. "Let us enjoy the sunrise and the song of the lark. . . ."

**TWO KINDS OF IMMORTALITY.** The "real immortalities within the universe" take the place of a belief in the survival of a conscious personality. The rationalist's interest is in the survival of matter; in the survival within his offspring of "those germs of inheritance which he drew, let us hope with pride and gratitude, from his sires"; in the survival of such influence for happiness, etc., as his personality may have imparted. Professor Ryle calls these purely physical, biological and personal or spiritual.

**PAIN.** Pain has an essential protective part to play in healing. It compels us to rest in a favourable position and to adopt other measures which promote healing. For civilized man the symptom of pain is the most helpful in diagnosis and therefore in relief or cure. Generally the anticipatory dread and mental pain is greater than the bodily pain. The worst pains are generally of short duration. The above observations are confirmed by the experience of air-raid casualties. Graver sufferings in chronic illness in some cases provide an argument for euthanasia.

**FEAR.** Fear, like pain, is a protective sensation or emotion. It stands in defence of life itself and leads to defensive activity—flight or fight. Fear reactions are of an essentially reflex character and have a biological utility. Physiological changes (e.g. adrenal secretion) help to improve efficiency for the abnormal efforts required for defence or escape. Fear may sometimes be a conditional reflex. Anxiety is more in control of the will than fear, but often produces discomforts which the sufferer believes are due to organic disease. "Passive or sub-acute fear or anxiety is always prevalent, and is perhaps the commonest reason why people consult doctors." Panic is epidemic fear. A strong individual can control panic. We have had illustration in plenty how people behave under danger. The "mutual aid" instinct is very important to all gregarious or social animals and man. It helps to cast out fear by using the disturbances set up.

**PHILOSOPHIA MEDICI.** Professor Ryle first quotes Newman's indictment of the "medical philosopher" "who has so simply fixed his intellect on his own science as to have forgotten the existence of any other" and who in consequence thinks himself "free to give advice and to insist upon rules, which are quite insufferable to any religious mind, and simply antagonistic to faith and morals". "He thinks," says Newman, "that whatever is true in his own science is at once lawful in practice. . . . I have known in England the most detestable advice given to young persons by eminent physicians, in consequence of this contracted view of man and his destinies." While denying the complete truth of the indictment, Professor Ryle admits that "there is a tendency diffused through the profession, more evident perhaps today than thirty years ago, to imbibe and retain the

influences of physical and chemical method, of the dissecting-room and the laboratory, of the operating-theatre and the X-ray department at the expense of those other influences which are derived from the old naturalist school. The naturalist school, while eager for all forms of evidence, has always based its doctrine on close observation and that intimate form of human understanding which is best conveyed by the Greek word *sympathy*. . . . A study of man and his symptoms was what Hippocrates required of us, and all unwittingly in the present era we are tending to replace it with an elaboration of techniques. The whole man and his comfort and, where possible, the early cure of his disorder or disease are today apt to be forgotten in the course of an intensive and very objective investigation of his parts." On two points he "joins issue" with Newman: (1) Man differs from the brutes in having a greater endowment of reason and a more complex personality; (2) he denies that any "reputable physician" has ever insisted on rules antagonistic to faith and morals and doctors are very rare who have given detestable advice to young persons. But knowledge grows and views vary. If materialism is to study the materials of Nature, it is not bad: if it is to do so to the neglect of Nature as a whole and man's relations with Nature, it is less commendable. Functions of a doctor are (1) to study nature, especially human nature; (2) to invoke the aid of all appropriate forms of knowledge; (3) on basis of diagnosis and prognosis to develop a rational plan of healing. He must teach people how to live healthily, and to this end he must gain their confidence: "there has been an appreciable loss of public trust in recent years." There is no time left in the curriculum to make aspiring *medicos* students of human nature. The doctor must analyse pains and fears and these must be studied. Public and patients must co-operate with doctor: they have been unreasonable and expect the doctor to be a magician. Superstitions have grown up around death, pain, fear: by study we see that they are necessary and are useful necessities.

In this summary I have scarcely noted the passages in which the author voices wholesale rejection of religious truth, natural and supernatural, and gives very fanciful versions of our beliefs. But I shall return to these points. I have sought to give my readers an outline of Professor Ryle's positive teaching.

Let us first turn our attention to the positive teaching of Professor Ryle as set forth in the above summary. We shall find that we are able to accept and even to welcome much of it. With him we say that there is no need to fear death, not because death is oblivion but because it is a home-coming. As to the fear of dying as distinct from death, Professor Ryle's remarks are comforting both in view of our own approaching death and for our consolation when our dear ones appear to be in agony. This applies to the physical fear of dying and of pain: as to the rational fear (which Professor Ryle rejects) arising from an ill-spent life, we have other effective means of overcoming that.

Professor Ryle's equation of soul with total personality and of this with fully conscious personality shows remarkable confusion of thought, but it leads him to his desired conclusion that the unborn babe has no soul. According to him the babe acquires a soul when it is born and sensations crowd upon it. But what receives these sensations? Surely something that was there before, even before the child was born. In other words, the soul. Only by giving terms a meaning of his own is Professor Ryle able to deny that the unborn babe has a soul. He goes on to say that he cannot admit that the ultimate Cause is anthropomorphic. But who said it was? And though "all this" does not necessitate heaven or an after-life, yet Professor Ryle adduces no reason to show that "all this" or anything else excludes heaven or an after-life which we believe in for quite different reasons. We will agree with the contention that good living implies the "optimum employment of limbs, etc.," but if the learned writer were to explain what he means by this, we should probably have to point out to him that restraint is necessary to prevent the balance of man's nature from getting upset. "Life to the full" in one direction, whether intellectual or animal, means a crippling of our faculties in other directions. There is no contradiction between "life to the full and improvement for self and posterity" and the desire for eternal life. So with immortality, there is no incompatibility between the immortality about which Professor Ryle is able to wax enthusiastic and personal conscious immortality.

In the chapter on pain, we accept most of what the author says and think that it should be very helpful. Yet we cannot agree that severe pain in chronic illness may sometimes be an argument for euthanasia. Perhaps the fondness of some doctors for euthanasia explains in part the decreased confidence in the medical profession which Professor Ryle notes in a later section. We agree with everything positive that the author has to say in the chapter on fear, with, of course, the caveat that it applies to physical fear and its manifestations. For there is a fear that is wisdom.

In his last chapter, "Philosophia Medici", Professor Ryle devotes a good deal of space to considerations of Cardinal Newman's indictment of doctors. But it seems to me that he entirely misses the point of the Cardinal's remarks and admits much of what he appears to be denying. Surely at this time of day materialism in philosophy can have but one meaning, viz. the reducing of everything to matter and the denial of a spiritual element independent of matter. Yet, by giving the term an entirely different meaning, and a very vague one at that, Professor Ryle is easily able to evade the charge of materialism. Nevertheless the whole of this little book brings Professor Ryle well within the terms of Newman's indictment. For Newman is claiming that the application of medical science must be limited by the directives of philosophy and religion: and Professor Ryle makes it quite clear that "what he doesn't know isn't knowledge". When he denies that any "reputable physician" has ever insisted on rules antagonistic to faith and morals and that doctors are very rare who have given detestable advice to

young persons, he implies that he knows the standards by which Newman judges these "rules" and "advice". He certainly does not know these standards, and I am quite certain that he would give rules and advice which Newman would have classed as detestable. We have an example of one when he supports euthanasia in the chapter on pain. But he says "knowledge grows"—yes, but not in everything—and "views vary"—as, of course, they will when there is no authority.

We learn with pain but without surprise that the medical profession has suffered "an appreciable loss of public trust in recent years". Professor Ryle hopes that this may be regained if doctors will study human nature and cultivate the gift of sympathy. Yet a doctor with no fixed code of morals to guide him, with no guidance in this study of human nature, is severely handicapped. The doctor must not wonder if the pain-racked sufferer from a deadly disease fears his approach, for the hypodermic syringe has become for him as terrifying as the guillotine or the hangman's noose.

In the concluding paragraphs of his book Professor Ryle tells us that around death, pain and fear

superstitions have grown up; of all of them a mystery has been made. And yet they have only awaited the study which we have been willing to accord to other natural phenomena to win release from darkness, to be endowed with a deep and enduring interest and to be accepted, in common with all other natural phenomena, as necessary things.

One gets the impression that the definition of a superstition is "something which Professor Ryle doesn't believe". Apart from that, I ask you to consider dispassionately whether a sentence could be more futile than the one I have just quoted. How can anyone seriously maintain that because death, pain and fear are seen to be "necessary" they thereby cease to be mysteries? Even if you put all thought of all religion (and superstition) out of your mind, death, pain and fear remain, and will remain, mysteries. You do not explain them by explaining that they are necessary. You do not even explain them away. They remain there, eternal enigmas.

The radical defect of Professor Ryle's exposition is that he will admit nothing that is not proved by human experience. He says, e.g. of personal survival, that "we can have no knowledge of a personal after-life, *since we have no experience of it and have met no one who has*". It even seems to me that such thinkers should find it difficult to admit moral values and virtues which are immeasurable and imponderable and do not fall within the direct experience of anyone except the person who exercises them. And the psychoanalyst would make short work of his virtue.

Rationalist writers like Professor Ryle are helped a good deal by meaningless metaphors. Thus the oblivion which they say follows on death is described as "peace" (p. 17). How can a being, which ceases to exist or, at least, to have a conscious existence, have "peace" in any intelligible sense of the word? Nor do they scruple to embellish their teachings with Scrip-

ture phrases: the oblivion after death is "the peace that passeth all understanding" (p. 16). This oblivion is again (p. 53) "well-earned sleep". But the whole point of the restfulness of sleep is that it is not completely unconscious: it is pleasant because we have the sensation of rest and of being refreshed when we wake again to full consciousness.

Because death means "the cessation of all the motor and sensory activities of life" the rationalist cannot believe that "any other motor or sentient part of us remains to move and feel in the way that we have been accustomed to move and feel" (p. 17). So death, "whether there be a spirit separate from sensation, thought and motion or not", must mean "arrest of activity and an oblivion not different from that which obtained before we left the womb" (pp. 17, 18). Here we see the danger of the doctor's accepting knowledge only from his own science. Since he has no experience of activity without the motor or sentient organs, such activity is inadmissible. The parallel with the unborn babe has no force because it has had no opportunity of exercising its intelligence or of acquiring knowledge which *incipit a sensu et perficitur in intellectu*. If the spirit of man survives, and Professor Ryle is careful in this particular passage to refrain from denying its survival, there is no reason why it should not exercise its intellectual functions. We know that in the ultimate analysis it does not depend on the material body. Indeed, it would be rather an absurdity that man's spirit should exist and be eternally unable even to be at all conscious of its own existence. Not infrequently the writer is led astray or tries to lead us astray by the etymological meaning of a word: as when he says that "the student of medicine or physic is, as the latter word implies, a student of nature and especially of human nature" (p. 10); or when he deduces a great deal from the fact that "living, after all, is an earthly process" (p. 36); or by the implied equation of biology and "the science of life" (p. 41).

On pp. 37-38 we have a remarkable passage which deserves some detailed attention. It is composed of a series of false antitheses. It is a great privilege and responsibility to watch and help the growth and development of a human being *not* by relying on prayers for guidance, *but* by knowing biology. To perform one's task *not* with any self-conscious motive or prospect of remote reward, *but* by the light of advancing science, this is a worthy responsibility. And so the dreary litany goes on. Could we not know biology and apply it and yet pray for guidance? Can we not perform our task by the light of advancing science and yet know that there is a just Judge who will reward us for so doing? Again, we should understand the emotions and control them "when troublesome" and not "repress or convert them with shame and regrets" or "importune heaven for forgiveness of the sins engendered of them". Yet, if we should "control" them, do we not fail in a duty if we do not control them, and, if we fail in a duty, surely we do wrong and ought to ask for forgiveness. The only inference we can draw is that, though we may have done wrong, Professor Ryle does not admit that that wrongdoing is a disobedience to our Maker.



Perhaps he does not think we have a Maker. But if I have not a Maker, I am not going to admit the right of anyone else to make laws for me—indeed, I will admit no law at all. While Professor Ryle deprecates praying, especially “asking”, he tells us with heavy unction *Laborare est orare* and that “to play and to laugh and to sing, to study and to learn, as well as to work, are also forms of prayer and thanksgiving”. Just so, but why then object to prayer? And as to thanksgiving, whom does Professor Ryle thank? The cosmic process?

Throughout his little book the author is continually looking for or, rather, asserting an incompatibility and antagonism between religion and science. I will take one more example. He imagines a religious critic of his work contending that “the poor and the oppressed, the ignorant, the miserable and the sinful” ought to be allowed “the consolation of something to look forward to in compensation for the present hurt and sorrow”. Professor Ryle asks: “Would it not be better still if their number were to be reduced by the use of knowledge open to us?” But again I ask, Why not both? Does an after-death reward mean that we cannot, or even that we should not, try to lessen the incidence of suffering and injustice on earth? In view of the Church’s record of precept and work in this latter direction, it is clear that in practice as well as in theory the thought of heaven does not exclude the improving of conditions, especially in favour of the poor, oppressed and ignorant, on earth. It would rather seem that the rationalist takes the unreasonable view that he cannot help people on earth if they or he have their attention distracted by thoughts of heaven. Yet from experience and our knowledge of human affairs we know that oppression, ignorance and suffering are not going to be completely banished from the world: though we as well as the rationalist wish that they could be so banished.

With pleasure I turn to a passage of Professor Ryle’s from which spiritual directors can learn a very important principle which is inclined to be neglected. I will quote Professor Ryle at length:

There are three ways of handling an offending emotion, and two of them are wrong. One is to run away, mentally, from the things which occasion it, and another to be forever fighting or grappling with it inwardly. *Both of these serve only to establish it more firmly in consciousness as the personal enemy.* The third and right way is to replace it or crowd it out by the employment of the faculties in healthy and useful tasks relating as far as possible to the external world (p. 79). (*Italics are mine.*)

Professor Ryle is speaking here of the management of the emotion of fear. I wish to give his remarks, of which I approve, a wider application in a somewhat different sphere, viz. that of spiritual difficulties, temptations and scruples. Apply to temptation the three ways of managing an emotion enumerated by the writer. First, to run away, mentally, from the difficulty or temptation without putting something else in the mind, something *totally* different, to take its place, simply fixes the mind on the temptation, even if it be as something from which we must flee: we do not

really  
result  
by occ  
rid of  
differ  
thing  
purely  
specti  
circum  
activi  
psych  
I wou  
usual  
when  
also.  
at the  
mean:  
our p  
simpl  
entire  
W  
asser  
the a  
is only  
the ch  
essent  
he tim

As to  
invest  
has r  
conce  
“esse  
presu  
judg  
few  
Proto  
judg  
ask  
teach  
wou  
Chri  
he k  
in th  
for s



really escape. Secondly, if one grapples with it inwardly, the same bad result follows *a fortiori*. Thirdly, if we replace the difficulty or temptation by occupying the mind with something entirely different, we effectively get rid of the temptation, since the mind cannot concentrate on a number of different things at once. This occupation of the mind with some other thing is much easier if it is something of an external character, because purely internal mental activity is more difficult and may easily end in introspection, which favours the return of temptation. It helps greatly in such circumstances if we can get our thoughts away from ourselves, and external activity is an excellent means to this end. All this is purely rational, natural psychology. You may say, should we not pray in time of temptation? I would answer that we should pray frequently against temptation at our usual times of prayer, especially morning and night, and at Holy Mass and when we receive Holy Communion. But we should use the natural remedies also. Our prayers against temptation will be efficacious even if not made at the moment of temptation. At the time of temptation let us pray by all means, but not with a prayer that will fix our minds on the temptation. If our prayer does this, it is best not to have recourse to explicit prayer, but simply to leave ourselves trustfully in God's hands and turn our minds to entirely different things in the way already explained.

We have considered, incidentally, quite a number of Professor Ryle's assertions about religion. As regards Christianity in general he tells us that the agnostic or rationalist

is only anti-religious in respect of what seems to him error in the method or doctrine of the churchmen, and he is intolerant, not of their Christianity (for who could dispute the essential teaching of Christ?), but of their mediævalism, of their failure to advance with the times and to accept the truths which science reveals (pp. 9-10).

As to "method" and "doctrine", has Professor Ryle made a thorough investigation of either? I think he would admit that he has not done so, has no intention of doing so, and feels too much contempt for what he conceives them to be to allow of his contemplating the task. What is the "essential teaching" of Christ which Professor Ryle admits and which he presumably admires? We are given no clue to it in the present book, but, judging from other rationalist writings, one feels sure that it consists in a few sentences of Our Lord's that happen to please Professor Ryle. A Protestant would have some difficulty in rejecting his claim to his own judgement of what Christ's teaching may be, but a Catholic can pertinently ask him what assurance he has that he knows which elements in Christ's teaching are essential and which not. Why is it not all essential? But we would ask a more radical question. Why does Professor Ryle want to accept Christ's teaching at all? We ask the question in all seriousness. I think he knows no more reason for accepting than for rejecting it. He is living in the shadow of a Christian tradition, weakened and diluted it is true, which for some obscure reason rationalists are unwilling completely to reject. As

to the refusal of Christianity to accept the truths of science, he cannot point to a single established scientific truth which the Church has proscribed.

He upbraids us with inventing ideas of judgement, purgatory and hell "without a shred or vestige of evidence" in support of our inventions (p. 16). To enter into a discussion of this with regard to these and other Catholic dogmas would mean debating the whole question of evidence. We cannot accept, nor ought any rational man to accept, the view that only the sense perception of the experimental sciences can be called evidence. And I am sure that such is Professor Ryle's view.

We could prolong almost indefinitely the consideration of Professor Ryle's fantastic ignorance and misconceptions of Christian doctrine and apologetic. He has, however, done us a service in showing us the weakness of the rationalist position and of the grounds on which it apparently rests.

A. BONNAR, O.F.M.

TH  
th  
as a  
recent  
writte  
Paul  
tourn  
unasc  
giving  
merel  
of a  
In bo  
here  
no T  
a wo  
Ryan  
that  
ciliate  
imme  
irony  
unlik  
of th  
T  
than  
Jesu.  
S.J.,  
well  
every  
note  
not  
Test  
for a  
this  
know  
know  
chari  
will  
testin  
Cori  
fastn  
The  
teein  
papy  
V  
exist  
the t

## HOMILETICS

*Eighteenth Sunday after Pentecost. (I Corinthians i, 4-8.)*

THIS short passage, which should be studied in conjunction with the three verses that precede it and v. 9 that follows it, is by no means easy as a subject for homiletic treatment. Of it and its immediate context a recent, highly authoritative commentator, Père Bernard Allo, O.P., has written: "Sa richesse même, sa densité, ses sous-entendus, ont pu donner à Paul quelque mal à le rédiger; et cela expliquerait l'obscurité de certaines tournures." The pericope itself, with v. 9 which for some reason now unascertainable was not included in the Sunday's epistle, forms the Thanksgiving. This characteristic feature of nearly all St. Paul's epistles is not merely a literary device commonly found in letters of this age. It is a form of *captatio benevolentiae*, a way of making immediate contact with his readers. In both the Epistles to the Thessalonians the Thanksgiving is very lengthy; here it is of ordinary length; in Galatians, for obvious reasons, there is no Thanksgiving and the epistle opens, as it has been remarked, "without a word of kindness". In the present instance it is difficult to accept Dr. Ryan's view (*The Epistles of the Sundays and Festivals*, vol. ii, p. 382, *in loc.*) that here "St. Paul in his preamble adopts a specially winning and conciliatory tone in order to prepare the way for the severe fault-finding which immediately follows". There is, as will be pointed out, some measure of irony in the apparently honeyed words of the Thanksgiving, and it is unlikely that this wholly escaped the notice of the more perceptive members of the Church in Corinth.

The first verse of the pericope (v. 4) calls for no comment. St. Paul thanks God for the free gift of grace received by the Corinthians *in Christo Jesu*. (For the meaning of this phrase in St. Paul, consult Père F. Prat, S.J., *The Theology of St. Paul*, Vol. II, Note M.) The verse following is well rendered by Fr. Spencer: "That you were enriched by Him with everything, with all eloquence and all knowledge." It has been frequently noted that St. Paul mentions intellectual or oratorical gifts only, and this not without a spice of irony. This is the first occurrence in the New Testament books of the word *gnosis* which is used so often in those books for a knowledge of spiritual truth, but which, as abundant examples from this epistle go to prove, is for St. Paul certainly not the highest form of knowledge. One may compare with this passage c. xiii, 1-2, 8 in which knowledge and sublimity of speech cut a poor figure by comparison with charity; languages will cease, and knowledge be superseded, but charity will never disappear. The Apostle continues (v. 6): "According as the testimony rendered to Christ has been established in you . . ." The Corinthians have received their various gifts in proportion to the steadfastness with which Paul and his associates instructed them in the faith. The word rendered, "established", is a legal term used in the sense of guaranteeing a business transaction; many instances of its use occur in the papyri.

V. 7 is perhaps the most difficult verse to render exactly; most of the existing translations fail to recognize that St. Paul is expressing a hope for the future, rather than a judgement on the present state of his converts.

Perhaps: "In such manner that you may come to lack nothing in any gift of grace, you who await eagerly the manifestation of our Lord Jesus Christ." *Charisma* is not used here, as in c. xii and the following chapters, for a *gratia gratis data*, but "may here be taken to mean every heavenly gift, external and internal" (Ryan). In v. 8 the subject is certainly Christ and not, as Fr. Spencer suggests in his version, "God" in v. 4. "Who will Himself also confirm you unto the end to make you blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ." (Compare here the *Westminster Version* which stresses the forensic metaphor: "He in turn will be to the end your warrant against arraignment . . .") There is assuredly no guarantee or promise that the converts will become irreproachable in the twinkling of an eye; there is, on the other hand, a strongly expressed hope and confidence that they may be found in such a condition at the great day. Estius, who is closely followed by later commentators, has some excellent reflections, e.g. he compares the hope expressed here with that of Philippians i, 6 and comments: "*Juxta hunc sensum rursus hic meminerimus, loqui Paulum non de singulis, qui erant in ecclesia Corinthiorum, sed de corpore, in quo erant alii aliis meliores et firmiores, quanquam et de unoquoque sperandum erat, prout materiam bonae spei quisque in se ostendebat.*" This interpretation is confirmed by the following verse (9): "God is trustworthy through whom you have been called into the fellowship of his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord." This, then, is St. Paul's ground for confidence—the *koinônia* or community of life with Christ in the Mystical Body.

Among various topics that could be developed after a commentary on this epistle, one seems to be pre-eminent, namely, the grace of final perseverance, and it is amply treated in the authors, as well as in such works as the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, where the Abbé Michel's article "Persévérance" (T. 12, coll. 1256-1304) is a very full statement of the whole question. The need for sermons of this kind may be illustrated in terms of the late Canon Keatinge's grave recollection: "I wish I could awaken faith enough in my dying sinners to give them a wholesome fear of hell. In all my years of deathbeds I have never had a case of final despair. My sinners die in presumption" (*The Priest: his Character and his Work*, p. 188).

*Nineteenth Sunday after Pentecost. (Ephesians iv, 23-28.)*

With chapter iv of the Epistle to the Ephesians begins the division commonly styled by commentators the *pars paraenetica*, devoted to exhortation and advice. In the first sixteen verses the faithful are exhorted "to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace"; to strive after interior unity through the virtues of faith, hope and charity; to seek exterior unity by the profession of the same Christianity wherein all may contribute according to their various gifts towards the building up of the Mystical Body of which Christ is the head. In the verse from iv, 17 onwards, St. Paul insists upon the ineluctable truth that Christians are called upon to lead lives very different from those of the heathen. "Walk no longer as the heathen do in the folly of their minds, being beclouded in their reason, alienated from the Divine Life by an ignorance due to the callousness of their hearts" (vv. 17-18, Fr. Spencer's translation). This

has led the pagan world to impurity and every sort of licentiousness. Not so have Christians learned Christ, that is to say the Gospel of Jesus the Messiah, whereby they have been taught to strip themselves, as regards their former manner of life, of their old nature, crumbling to ruin through the deceitful lures of the passions.

Here begins the portion chosen for this Sunday and, as is so often the case, in the middle of a sentence or of an argument. The moral rot and decay of the old nature are contrasted with the renovation and reclothing of the new man. In the first words "Be renewed in the spirit of your mind," the "spirit" is not the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity, as some older writers maintained; it is, as Swete remarks, the sphere of the Holy Spirit's operations, and its renewal and recreation are their work. Similarly, in v. 24, the new man who is to be put on, "the one created Godlike in righteousness and in holiness of the truth" (Fr. Spencer's version) is not Christ, but man himself made new in Christ, re-made in the image of God by holy baptism. The creation of man in the image and likeness of God as it is recorded in the first chapters of Genesis is here recalled by the reference to man's re-creation by the sacraments of the Catholic Church. What is termed in St. John's Gospel (iii, 3, 5) a re-birth or regeneration is here styled a creation or re-creation. The terminology differs, but the supernatural reality of the divine gift conferred is the same. The virtues that are mentioned are justice (not the cardinal virtue, but justness or righteousness) and holiness, and these, in Père Huby's words, are regarded as "the *milieu vital*, the spiritual climate in which the new man has been placed so as to subsist by them and to move in them; they constitute his vital field of action" (*Verbum Salutis* series, Vol. viii, p. 209). And, as the rule of the passions in the old man was grounded in deception and lies, so the new reign of justness and holiness is rooted in the truth.

In the remaining verses the Apostle turns to the virtues that are to be displayed by the new man in the full enjoyment of his spiritual inheritance, in the glory of his new creation in righteousness and holiness. The fact that we are members of the same Mystical Body is a prime argument against lying and in favour of speaking the truth at all times. The old unregenerate nature was a prey to illusions, to the deceptive urgency of the passions; for the new man in the general ordering of his life *uberrima fides* is ever to be regarded as a condition of his Christian existence.

Vv. 26-27 is rendered by Fr. Spencer: "*Be angry and sin not*; let not the sun go down upon your wrath, and give no opportunity to the devil." The italicized words, a quotation from Ps. iv, 5, are better rendered: "If you become angry, beware of falling into sin". The command clearly refers not to being angry, but to the avoidance of sin when in a state of anger. A plausible explanation of the second member of the sentence is given by Estius who writes: "Ratio schematis est, quia solis occasus apud Judaeos initium erat diei; quare si quem irascentem nox occuparet, is iram retinebat usque in alterum diem." In any case, the sense of the imagery is not obscure: anger is to be put away as soon as possible, and not merely anger but all occasion of the same. So no opportunity will be given to the devil, whereas anger if allowed to persist may well lead to hatred and the desire for revenge. (Compare the *Westminster Version's* excellent note on v. 26.)

The last of the commands included in this extract is a warning against theft. "Let him who used to steal, steal no longer, but rather let him labour hard, working with his hands in an honest way, so that he may have something to share with the needy." (Fr. Spencer's translation.) Some surprise has been expressed that St. Paul finds it necessary to warn his converts against so dishonourable a sin as theft. (Equally astonishing at first sight is the mention of *porneia* in the Apostolic decree of Acts xv, but the word may well mean, in this context, marriage within the forbidden degrees).<sup>1</sup> It is answered that the early Christians were for the most part people of small means who might easily have been tempted to add to their meagre resources at the expense of their employers. In any event, the message seems to be addressed chiefly to those who already have a habit of pilfering. Not only must they avoid theft; they must gain their living honestly and might strive to have something over for the benefit of those more needy than themselves.

It is unnecessary to suggest many topics for sermons on the texts contained in this extract. Leaving aside the exhortations against lying, anger and stealing, a sermon on the effects of baptism and the perfection to which Christians are called would find excellent scriptural material in this epistle.

*Twentieth Sunday after Pentecost . (Ephesians v, 15-21)*

Once again the epistle is taken from St. Paul's letter to the Ephesians and, with the doubtful exception of the last verse, is a continuation of the long exhortation, stretching from c. iv, 17 to c. v, 20 (or 21), which is throughout all its length a warning to Christians that they must strive after complete reformation of life. In the interval between c. iv, 28 (the final verse of last Sunday's epistle) and the beginning of this pericope, St. Paul has been inveighing against foolish, lewd and injurious talk, and against any tendency to make light of words or deeds contrary to holy purity. His converts should be "imitators of God, as beloved children"; they have been called out of the darkness of heathendom into the full light and splendour of the Christian faith and life; they must avoid any action that might grieve the Holy Spirit of God by whom they have been "sealed against the day of redemption". There can be no community of thought or practice between those who are still sinners, and the disciples of Christ; they are not less opposed than are darkness and light. All evil things shall be brought to light and shall suffer reproof.

Hence, says the first verse of today's epistle, Christians must walk carefully and warily, not as unwise but as wise men, "ransoming the time, because the days are evil". (*Westminster Version*). The phrase translated, "ransoming the time", has been variously interpreted, though the general sense of making the best use of time is evident. Moulton and Milligan (*Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament* in loc.) agree with an earlier commentator that the meaning is not so much "buying up" or "making market to the full of" the opportunity that is offered as "buying back (at the expense

<sup>1</sup> Cf. CLERGY REVIEW; April, 1941, pp. 287-290.

of personal watchfulness and self-denial) the present time, which is now being used for evil and godless purposes". The days are said to be evil by reason of the power of the devil in this world and his dominion over souls. So (v. 17) Christians are not to be *aphrones* or foolish (a word explained by Dr. Hort as implying "a want of mental sanity and sobriety, a reckless and inconsiderate habit of mind") but prudent men, understanding what is the will of God in their regard and carrying it out by the practice of the commandments. An example of arrant foolishness is given in the following verse: "And be not drunk with wine, wherein is riotousness." There is, as should be obvious even to the most rabid teetotaler, no condemnation of wine as such (cfr. I Tim. v. 23), but the abuse of wine is rebuked. Any student of the dining habits of the Greco-Roman world would agree that orgies were sufficiently common to justify serious warnings against such excesses. It has been claimed that St. Paul is here specially concerned with the type of abuse condemned in I Corinthians xi, 20 ff., but there appears to be no clear proof of this from the present verse of Ephesians. It is a general warning against the danger of drunkenness with no particular allusion to the *agape* or the Eucharist. Whereas the world of that day was so largely occupied with the pleasures of the senses, Christians, says St. Paul, are to be filled with the Holy Spirit, and to manifest their joy in believing "in psalms and hymns and spiritual canticles". The reference to hymns recalls the famous passage in the younger Pliny's letter to Trajan in which he mentions the custom of the Christians of assembling together regularly on a certain day and of "singing a hymn to Christ as to a god" (*carmen Christo quasi deo dicere*). St. Paul adds that Christians are to sing not merely with their lips, but in their hearts or, in St. Jerome's words: "Sic cantet servus Christi, ut non vox canentis, sed verba placeant quae leguntur." On the words *Gratias agentes semper pro omnibus*, St. Thomas remarks that we are commanded to pray for all God's gifts whether they be favourable or unpropitious. For, as St. Jerome declares: "Christianorum propria virtus est etiam in his quae adversa putantur, referre gratias Creatori." The same holy Doctor has some pointed comments on v. 21 *Subjecti invicem in timore Christi* when he reminds bishops, priests and the whole order of teachers that they are subject to their own subjects. "Hoc interest inter gentium principes et Christianorum, quod illi dominantur subditis, nos servimus; et in eo majores sumus, si minimi omnium fuerimus."

Among possible topics for sermons, one may suggest, as highly appropriate to the times in which we live, a commentary on the words: *Redimentes tempus quoniam dies mali sunt*. Suitable illustrations are not far to seek.

#### *Feast of Christ the King. (Colossians i, 12-20)*

Some part of this epistle (namely vv. 12-14) are the last three verses of the epistle for the twenty-fourth Sunday after Pentecost. But there appears to be no Sunday or festal epistle other than that of the present feast which gives so long an extract from that most magnificent of all opening chapters in the Apostolic writings, the first chapter of the Epistle



to the Colossians. Unfortunately for the preacher of homilies its sublimity is only equalled by its difficulty. The epistles are rarely easy in themselves, and are certainly far from easy to explain to our congregations. The first chapter of Colossians may well be reckoned the most difficult of all the extracts in common use, and for its proper understanding there is need of information which is assuredly not possessed by most of the faithful in the majority of our churches.

First, then, a word about the purpose of the epistle and the special needs of the Church at Colossae. The foundation of that Church was the work not of St. Paul himself, but of Epaphras whom, it seems, St. Paul had converted at Ephesus. The faithful of the church were fervent in faith and charity (ii, 5), but were in great danger of being misled by false teachers who sought to impose upon them the Mosaic rites and the observance of the Sabbath (in other words, they were Judaizers) and to introduce a superstitious cult of angels as a practice necessary for salvation. The exact school of thought to which these innovators belonged is still a matter of discussion, but it is clear that their teaching, more particularly their wholly exaggerated angelology, was opposed to the Christian conception of our Lord as the one mediator of the New Testament. Hence St. Paul in this epistle develops his Christological teaching more fully than in any of the letters anterior to his captivity, and stresses the truths that Christ, the image of the invisible God, is the omnipotent creator and head of the whole universe, the angels not excepted; that He is in a special manner head of the Church which is His body; that He is the only Mediator between God and men; that His work is a work of reconciliation, since through His cross He has abolished the Old Law, overcome evil spirits and brought about remission of sins; that by baptism men become members of the Body of Christ and share in His redemption; and that they are straitly bound to set their minds on the things which are above and to mortify their evil desires.

These ideas, and others like them, form the main teaching of this epistle and may act as a guide to the verses that must now be considered in detail. The preceding verses, beginning with v. 9, are St. Paul's prayer that the Colossians may advance in knowledge and wisdom through Christ. This thought leads him to speak of Christ as the only means of true progress by whom his hearers "may be endowed by the might of His glory with all strength to endure everything patiently and joyfully" (Fr. Spencer), or "to endure and to be patient cheerfully, whatever comes . . ." (Moffatt). Here, then, begins v. 12, the first verse of today's epistle which may be rendered: "Giving thanks to the Father who has qualified you (Lightfoot: 'made you competent') to have a share in the inheritance of the saints in light," a verse which strongly emphasizes the gratuitous character of the privilege, the fact that such a gift is beyond man's natural powers and calls for a supernatural quality (or competence) coming from God, if man is to enter into that kingdom of light which is the heritage of God's holy ones. Further, St. Paul continues, the Father has delivered us from "the power of darkness" (i.e. from ignorance, sin and the dominion of evil spirits), and "has transferred (or removed) us into the kingdom of His beloved Son; in whom we have redemption, the remission of sins". The redemption is the work of the Son and with it is mentioned its principal



effect, the remission of sins; this redemption we truly have *in* Him, that is in so far as we are united to Him by grace in the Mystical Body.

From this point onwards the verses in the epistle for today are commented upon very fully by Père Prat in his excellent book, *The Theology of St. Paul* (Vol. I, bk. iv, c. 2: "La primauté du Christ"). Hence, it will only be necessary to draw attention to a few outstanding points.

(1) Christ is the image of the Father ("who is the image of the invisible God"). It has often been remarked that the idea of an image neither includes nor excludes perfect representation of its exemplar. But here, in St. Paul's description of the Father's beloved Son "in whom dwells all the fullness of the God-head corporally", it is clear that the image is so perfect as to be fully on a par with its archetype.

(2) Since "the invisible God" is certainly the Father, many writers have concluded that invisibility designates "that personal and incommunicable attribute in virtue of which the Father, source and principle of the divinity, sends the other divine Persons and is not sent by them" (Prat, *in loc.*).

(3) St. Paul adds that Christ is the "first-born (or first-begotten) before every creature". Anyone who has access to the back volumes of the *Journal of Theological Studies* would do well to read the late Prof. C. F. Burney's article, "Christ as the APXH of Creation" (Vol. XXVII, pp. 160 ff.), an elaborate and scholarly exposition of St. Paul's rabbinical treatment of Old Testament reminiscences in these verses of Colossians. The title seems to contain two leading ideas, each of them stressed by rival groups of commentators. There is the idea of priority in existence (i.e. born or begotten before every creature) and that of pre-eminence (i.e. set above every creature). When the Apostle continues: "For in Him all things were created . . ." he appears to be referring not to any doctrine of divine exemplarism, but to the conception that, in the Son, all things find their supreme centre of unity and cohesion (Fr. Martindale has developed this idea in several of the sketches in one of his most delightful books, *The Goddess of Ghosts*). It is made clear in the text that the application is truly universal—the doctrine applies to all things in heaven and earth, seen or unseen, "whether thrones, or dominations, or principalities, or powers—all creation is through Him and unto Him" (cp. Apoc. xxii, 13: "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end"). Christ is, as one commentator puts it, the keystone of the vault of the universe. "And He Himself exists before all things, and in Him all things hold together."

(4) Further, He is Head of the Church, which is His Body. Of it He is the Beginning (what Lightfoot styles "the originating power") from which derives the life of grace and glory. He is, again, "the first-born from the dead" (cp. I Cor. xv, 20; Phil. iii, 10, 20, 21; Apoc. i, 5), first not merely in order of time, but in rank and dignity. He is, in truth, first in all things so that "in all things He may hold the pre-eminence".

(5) Finally, it is written that "it was the pleasure of the Father that all the fullness (*plērōma*) should dwell in Him". Is this the fullness of grace, as St. Thomas holds, or the fullness of the divinity as St. John Chrysostom claims? Père Prat, the master interpreter of St. Paul in recent times, considers that, since St. Paul does not limit the meaning, the expression should be left in all its amplitude; to have the pre-eminence in all things,

Christ should be entirely peerless in the two orders of nature and of grace. And as in the Incarnation, so in the Redemption, God's loving purposes extend to all things; heaven and earth and all things are reconciled to God, and this reconciliation is indeed a peace-making through the blood shed upon our Lord's holy Cross. (Once again, an appreciative reference should be made to the excellent note to cp. i, 24 in the *Westminster Version* "Colossians".)

The ideas contained in these verses are, as even a cursory treatment may have shown, as compact and varied as any in the New Testament. The attempt to explain them to our congregations will not be without its complexities. Yet the effort may well be made, even at the expense of producing mental indigestion. Bishop Hedley says somewhere that, unless we occasionally talk over our people's heads, a great part of God's revelation will go unheard or unheeded.

JOHN M. T. BARTON.

In  
two in  
God  
nature  
and o  
claim  
hum  
family  
we an  
Comm  
child  
child  
shoul  
this s  
W  
share  
prie  
and  
mean  
They  
again  
thou  
he w  
in al  
C  
thin  
they  
hom  
hous  
fath  
the  
men  
chie  
neve  
and  
bein  
Bles  
to C  
V

## DOCTRINE FOR CHILDREN

### THE COMMANDMENTS FOR SENIORS

(Concluded)

#### *The Fourth Commandment*

*Introduction.* You will remember that the Ten Commandments are in two important sections, the first three dealing with our duties to Almighty God and the remaining seven with our duties to our neighbour. Quite naturally, the first of the "neighbour" Commandments is about ourselves and our parents, who are our nearest neighbours, and who have the first claims upon us. The family and the home form the foundation of all human society. (This will need a little further explanation: individual, family, group, state, etc.) Whilst we are helpless babies, and all the time we are young, we depend upon our parents. To many boys and girls this Commandment seems almost unnecessary; they cannot understand how children can do anything else than honour and love their parents. Some children, however, are thoughtless and neglectful; and in case anyone should say that duties to parents are only "natural", God has laid down this supernatural law: "Honour thy father and thy mother".

We must honour not only our parents, but also those who in any way share the work they do for us, all who teach and train us. Therefore our priests, teachers, guardians, masters and mistresses, all our rightful superiors, and all in lawful authority over us are entitled to our "honour". This means that we must treat them with obedience, respect, reverence and love. They forfeit the right to our honour only when what they tell us to do is against the law of God, but this does not happen very often. St. Paul thought the Fourth Commandment very important indeed. He said (and he was inspired by the Holy Ghost to say it), "Children, obey your parents in all things, for this is well pleasing to the Lord" (Col. iii, 20).

*Obedience.* Some children do not find it easy always to obey their parents, thinking that as they get older they may please themselves about what they do. This is quite wrong. Until children are old enough to leave home and look after themselves, or to get married and have their own household, they are subject to their parents and must obey them. The father of a family is always the head of his own household, even though the sons and daughters who may still be living with him are grown-up men and women. A father is not strict for the sake of being strict; his chief idea in governing his home is to keep everyone happy. Fathers never cease to love their children; and children should love their parents and should try to bring them happiness—and this is done principally by being obedient. When you find it difficult to obey, remember that Our Blessed Lord, although the God of heaven and earth, was Himself obedient to Our Lady and St. Joseph in the holy house of Nazareth. "He was

subject to them," says Holy Scripture. The perfect model of obedience for all children is Jesus, the Divine Boy.

*Reverence : Respect : Love.* It sometimes happens that when boys and girls are growing up they notice that their parents are by no means perfect, and that they have faults. All the same, they must be loved and respected, and their imperfections must be overlooked. Children will easily be able to make excuses for their parents (if excuses are needed) by remembering how much their parents have done for them in babyhood and infancy, when they were sick, and when they were perhaps very naughty and difficult. The debt of gratitude that we owe to our parents for their care of us is one that can never be fully paid, but we should take any chance that comes our way of paying some of the debt. Whenever father or mother need our help, we must give it. If parents are ill we must look after them; and when they grow old we must care for them lovingly and tenderly, and make their last days happy. Occasionally, when children grow up and "get on" in the world, they despise their parents and are ashamed of them. Never be guilty of breaking the Fourth Commandment in this way. Never insult your parents or say hard and cruel things to them; and, of course, never dare to raise your hand to strike them—a truly dreadful thing.

*Guardians and Teachers.* If you have lost your parents, be very grateful to those who take their place by looking after you. Children who have been adopted should have a deep love and respect for their foster-parents. Our Lord Himself, as you know, had a foster-father, St. Joseph, whom He always loved and obeyed, as was becoming in a dutiful child.

Since Almighty God has established His Church to guide and govern mankind in spiritual matters, we must obey the Pope, and our Bishops and priests, who are the teachers of the Church. Our school-teachers also have a special claim upon our obedience, because they spend their lives in training us. If you call to mind some of the ill-mannered children you know, and then remember that a teacher is obliged to look after them all day long, you will understand how difficult the life of a teacher can be. Obstinate and stubborn children seem to make everyone round them—including their teacher—very unhappy. Be bright and cheerful, even if you are sometimes punished; and make the most of your schooldays in order to be well prepared for your after-life. Others who have special claims upon our obedience are masters and mistresses, civil rulers, and people appointed to official positions by the Government.

If you know yourself to be a rather wilful child, pray to St. Zita, asking her to help you to be obedient. She was a little scullery-maid in a large household where there were many other servants. She was not very well treated; in fact she was sometimes beaten, but she always remained obedient and respectful. Her gentleness so won everybody's heart that at last she was put in charge of all the other servants, and she spent her whole life in being kind and good to them, helping them to be obedient, as she

herself  
her a  
TH  
Freem  
dange  
they o

In  
no or  
that i  
needs  
men :  
only  
with  
as to  
that :  
spirit  
kill."  
T  
just v  
(  
enem  
(2  
else  
life,  
(3  
the i  
is no  
unles  
A  
this  
that  
year  
S  
man  
self.  
man  
life.  
C  
a kin  
men

herself had always been. It was obedience that made her happy, and made her a Saint.

There is a note in the Catechism about Secret Societies, such as the Freemasons. Catholics may not belong to such Societies because they are dangerous to the Faith. Moreover, they have no right to the obedience they demand from those who belong to them.

### *The Fifth Commandment*

*Introduction.* Because God is the Creator and Supreme Lord of life, no one else may usurp His dominion over it by destroying it—human life, that is. God has given to man dominion over the lives of animals, for his needs; but he has no dominion over his own life or over that of his fellow-men: this belongs to God alone. As with the other Commandments, only the chief sin is mentioned in the Fifth—killing; but all sins connected with killing are included. Moreover, the killing refers to the soul as well as to the body; this is why *Scandal* is forbidden. In general we may say that any sin which destroys, shortens, spoils or endangers bodily life or spiritual life is forbidden by the Fifth Commandment: "Thou shalt not kill."

There are three cases in which it is lawful to take human life: in a just war, in self-defence, and if it is the duty of the public executioner.

(1) If a man is fighting for his country, he does not sin by killing the enemy.

(2) If a man is attacked by an assailant (or goes to the help of someone else who is attacked), and he kills the attacker whilst defending his own life, he is not guilty of sin.

(3) If the public executioner (in England the hangman) is carrying out the instructions of the lawful authority in putting a criminal to death, he is not guilty of sin.

Obviously, if one person kills another accidentally, there is no sin, unless the cause of the death is carelessness or negligence.

*Murder.* Putting to death a human being unlawfully. In whatever way this is done, it is the same sin. Shooting a man through the heart, so that he is killed immediately, or gradually poisoning him through a whole year until he dies—these are equally murder.

*Suicide.* This is self-murder, which is the crime of a coward: only a man who cannot face up to the difficulties of life would thus destroy himself. To put an end to one's own life is just as clearly breaking the Commandment "Thou shalt not kill" as it is to put an end to someone else's life.

*Gluttony and Drunkenness.* These sins frequently shorten life; they are a kind of slow killing, and are therefore forbidden by the Fifth Commandment.

*Fighting and Quarrelling.* This does not refer to the little tiffs that children sometimes have, but to the quarrels that result in serious injury—and sometimes death—caused by striking and wounding. A very dangerous habit, which children sometimes develop, is throwing stones. More than once it has resulted in someone's being killed, and occasionally it means injury for life, perhaps by the loss of an eye. Stones are very hard; leave them on the ground.

*Anger.* A feeling of dislike or resentment, which passes away after a time.

*Hatred.* A settled feeling of intense dislike or resentment which remains and rankles in the heart. It often results from jealousy and envy.

*Revenge.* Doing someone evil because they have injured us; it usually follows anger or hatred.

*Anger, Hatred, Revenge,* and in a lesser degree *Envy* and *Jealousy*, are forbidden by the Fifth Commandment because they sometimes lead to *Murder*. Most murders are committed in fits of passion, whilst the murderer's mind is clouded by anger or hatred or the desire for revenge.

There is such a thing as "just anger", which is not sinful. This was the anger felt by Our Lord when He drove out the buyers and sellers who were desecrating the Temple. Such anger has a just cause, it is not a blind anger, and it is always under the control of the mind.

*Scandal* means "stumbling-block": it is "tripping up" someone by causing him to stumble or fall in his spiritual life, and thus injuring his soul—or even killing it—by sin. Never teach anyone to be wicked, or lead another into sin. Our Lord warned us against this when He said (Matt. xviii, 6): "He that shall scandalize one of these little ones that believe in Me, it were better for him that a millstone should be hanged about his neck and that he should be drowned in the depth of the sea."

*Bad Example.* This is rather like *Scandal*, but is not so serious, although it is serious enough. Always be on your guard about giving bad example to younger brothers or sisters. Set them a good example, especially by being obedient and well-behaved towards your parents.

It is very unlikely that you will ever break the Fifth Commandment by being guilty of *Murder*, but you might break it in other ways. The very sound of the words should be enough to warn you of the ugly things they stand for: *Anger, Hatred, Revenge, Envy, Jealousy, Scandal*. Make up your minds to be kind, forgiving, generous-minded and gentle with others, and there will be little likelihood of your offending God against the Commandment which says: "Thou shalt not kill."

### *The Sixth and Ninth Commandments*

*Introduction.* Here are two Commandments which are chiefly for grown-up people: "Thou shalt not commit adultery" and "Thou shalt not covet

(desire) thy neighbour's wife." These Commandments are taken together because the Ninth forbids thoughts and desires of the same nature as the deeds forbidden by the Sixth. Although principally for grown-up people—and you will not understand all about these Commandments until you are grown-up yourself—you are supposed to know something regarding these laws of Almighty God, in order that you may be on your guard against the various sins they forbid, as well as against the chief sins when you are men and women. Some boys and girls quickly become grown-up in their minds, and they talk about things that concern only men and women—and not good and pure men and women at that. They indulge in immodest jests and impure talk. Don't listen to them if you can avoid doing so, and don't defile your own lips by imitating such people. If you hear boys or girls talking in an impure and disgusting way, or if they write nasty little notes and make dirty little drawings, or are guilty of disgusting actions, report the matter to your teacher or to the Head of the school, telling the boys or girls concerned what you are going to do. This is not sneaking, any more than it would be if you saw a child setting fire to the school and reported it. The fire might destroy the whole building; and the sins just mentioned might corrupt the minds of decent children and spoil their souls.

Do not worry too much over the exact explanation of the big sins forbidden by the Sixth Commandment; the knowledge of these will come to you as you grow older. If you have difficulties about the matter, confide in someone who you think will help you. You can always go to the priest in the Confessional, but you may also get much help from your parents in delicate matters of the kind we are thinking of, or from a sensible aunt or uncle, or from a teacher who understands you. Don't talk about such things to older boys and girls, especially if you know that they are not well behaved. Unfortunately some children soon become very "knowing" in these matters, but they are not the kind of companion you should choose, and rather than being a help to you they will cause you to become as bad as they are themselves.

*Adultery.* This is the chief sin against the Sixth Commandment, and it concerns grown-up people who are married; the first half of the word—adult—will remind you of this. *Adultery* is forbidden by Almighty God because it not only ruins the sinner's own soul, but also destroys the happiness of the family: the happiness of a family is more important than the happiness of an individual, because the family is the important "Unit" in human society, as you will remember from what was said about it in the Fourth Commandment. Most boys and girls eventually get married and have their own family. They meet someone whom they get to like very much, and who returns their affection; this is called "falling in love". They find that each loves the other better than anyone else in the world. They become engaged, promising to marry one another; and at length, before God's altar, and in the presence of the priest and the other people in church,

they are made husband and wife. Each makes a vow to take the other "from this day forward, for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer, in sickness and in health, till death do us part". No words could be clearer; they are a solemn promise, a vow, made by a man and a woman, to love each other best, whatever happens, until death. To enable them to keep their vow God gives them the grace of the Sacrament of Matrimony. If, in spite of their vow and the grace of the Sacrament, either of them is unfaithful and loves someone else—this is *Adultery*, a very grave sin indeed. It brings much suffering to the wronged husband or wife, and to any children they may have, spoiling the happiness of the home and family, and bringing shame upon the guilty parties. It is not surprising that St. Paul says: "Adulterers shall not possess the Kingdom of God." One who betrays such a trust as to be false to his marriage vows is abominable in the sight of God: but it is a noble thing to be true and loyal. When the time comes for you to get married, pray for special guidance, and choose your partners very carefully, remembering that you are to love them best till the end of life. A happy marriage means a happy home, one of the most beautiful things on earth.

Marriage is for the future. For the present, what you must avoid in order not to break the Sixth Commandment are the following: all acts of impurity by yourself or with another, such as unchaste touches, looks or words. Do not be over-anxious about this matter. If something is necessary—for cleanliness or for some other good reason—it is not a sin; neither can it be a sin unless it is a conscious and deliberate action. Always act with decency and modesty, and you need not be afraid of offending against God's law of purity.

As the Sixth Commandment forbids all acts against purity, so does the Ninth Commandment forbid all internal sins of the same kind, all unchaste thoughts and desires. Temptations are not sins: unclean thoughts will sometimes enter your mind without your being in any way to blame for them. Turn your mind at once to something else, something quite different, and then breathe a word of prayer to Our Lady.

To love our Holy Mother Mary, trying to imitate her pure and beautiful life, is the best way of preserving the purity of our soul. Avoid dangerous people, places and books, and in particular be faithful about regular Confession and Holy Communion, so that you will be strengthened by the grace of God against all temptations. Purity is called "The Angelic Virtue" because it makes us resemble God's Angels themselves. It brings a quiet, peaceful strength to the soul which no other virtue can give, and which commands the respect of our fellow-creatures, whether they are good themselves or not. Moreover, it brings the certain promise of Heaven: "Blessed are the clean of heart, for they shall see God."



*The Seventh and Tenth Commandments*

*Introduction.* Because the Tenth Commandment, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's goods", forbids the desire to take what belongs to someone else, it is usually bracketed with the Seventh, the Commandment of honesty: "Thou shalt not steal." There are, as we shall see, many ways of disobeying God when He says: "Thou shalt not steal." You are not likely to do this in any gross and serious manner, by breaking into a house like a burglar, or by waiting round a corner to hit someone on the head with a big stick and rob him. It is in small ways, and secretly, that boys and girls are tempted to break the Seventh Commandment. Make up your minds to be strictly honest with everyone, not excluding the members of your own family. Don't think that you may, for instance, take coppers from your parents without sinning, because you know that they will easily forgive you. If you want something from home, ask for it; and if your father or mother says "No", then do without it, like a sensible child.

*Robbery.* Stealing quite openly, and with violence to the one who is robbed. Surely none of you will ever be guilty of this.

*Larceny.* Deliberate theft, done secretly. Judas was a thief and a cheat, stealing secretly; and he came to a terrible end, as you know, actually betraying the best of Masters for thirty pieces of silver, thirty paltry shillings. There are few things that grow on people so strongly as secret theft. The reason is that they can go on stealing secretly for a long time without being discovered; but they are always found out in the end. Remember that small thefts can accumulate until they become mortal sins. If you have fallen into the habit of secret theft, however small, give it up at once, or you will bring yourself into grave trouble, apart from being guilty of sin. It is a great anxiety for a parish priest or for teachers to have a thief in the school; and it is a fearful disgrace to be expelled from school for stealing.

*Fraud.* This is a sin of cheating, usually committed in buying and selling. If a shopkeeper gives short weight, or sells inferior articles in the place of good ones, he is guilty of fraud. If a customer gets too much change, and keeps it, he is defrauding the shopkeeper. It is obviously wrong to say to yourself (if you receive too much change), "But the shopkeeper gave it to me." He didn't *mean* to give it to you; it was a mistake, which you must rectify, otherwise you are a thief.

Apart from the clear sins of theft already mentioned, there are numerous other ways in which we can be guilty of breaking the Seventh Commandment: helping someone else to steal; not paying lawful debts; wasting or spoiling what does not belong to us; buying stolen property; damaging other people's property; borrowing things and not returning them in good condition. This last-named fault is one to be very careful about; to say the least, it may cause you to lose your friends.

There is a story told of an old professor who had a large library. One day a friend who had called at the house was looking round the bookshelves when he came upon a book which he wanted to borrow. He asked the professor to lend it to him, but the professor refused, saying: "You may stay here and read it, and you may come as often as you please to see my books, but I shall not allow you to borrow any of them." His friend felt hurt, and said: "You know me well enough; surely you can trust me to bring this book back." Then the professor said to him: "You see all these books in my library?" "Yes," answered the visitor. "Well," said the professor, "they are all borrowed!" If the story is true, the professor was a wicked old thief.

*Restitution.* An important matter to remember about stealing is that we have not only to be pardoned for the sin, but we have also to make up for it by giving back what we have taken, or by making good the damage we have done. This is called *Restitution*: it binds in conscience, and must always be made. For example, if a man had stolen five pounds, and the one from whom he had taken it was dead and had left no relations to whom it might be restored, the thief would still be bound to *Restitution*. When confessing his sin he would be obliged to explain to the priest, who would then tell him how to pay his debt—perhaps by giving the money to the poor.

Very frequently, especially when we are children, we wish that we had things that other people have. We cannot help this; it is not a sin. If, however, we dwell upon it, and work ourselves up about it, a strong desire will take hold of us, and we may begin scheming and planning to get the thing we so much desire: this would be breaking the Tenth Commandment. The great danger for us, if we covet our neighbour's goods is that we shall go still further and become actual thieves. Be fair and just with everyone, and then your conscience will be clear: you will never be guilty of even small sins against God's law of honesty: "Thou shalt not steal."

### *The Eighth Commandment*

*Introduction.* One of the dearest possessions a person can have is a good name, a good reputation; it is for the protection of this good name that Almighty God has given us the Eighth Commandment: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour." The chief sin forbidden by this Commandment is that of giving false evidence on oath in a Court of Justice, which is always a mortal sin. There are, however, other ways of "bearing false witness"; and when you look down the list of sins against the Eighth Commandment, you say to yourself: "What an ugly collection!" You are right; and people who are in the habit of committing these sins have very ugly characters. Lawyers, detectives and prison

warders tell us that one of the first things noticed about a criminal is that he is a liar. Even if you have done something wrong, and are punished for it, always tell the truth. If your family and friends know that they can trust you, it is a sign that Almighty God can trust you too. Being perfectly truthful is getting close to God, Who is Truth itself; but being a liar is getting uncomfortably close to the Devil, who is "The Father of Lies".

*False Testimony.* Knowingly to give false evidence, on oath, in a Court of Justice. This is a double sin, and is always grievous. It is not only lying, but also Forgery, which you will remember is a grave sin against the Second Commandment. The only rule to follow, if you have to appear in the Court, is this: "The truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth."

*Lying.* To say or do anything in order that people will believe it to be true, when we know it is false, is a lie. Lies can be acted as well as told. It is not surprising that Herod, one of the worst men who ever lived, was a liar. Our Lord called him "that fox" because he was so sly and deceitful; and it was an acted lie that brought about Herod's death (Acts xii, 21-3). One day, when he made a speech to his courtiers, they said that he was a god; and instead of denying it he pretended that it was true, smiling at them and nodding his head, as much as to say: "Of course I'm God." He was struck down at once by a horrible disease, so that his body rotted away, and, in the words of the Scriptures: "He was eaten up by worms."

There are three kinds of lies: *Jocose*, told in jest; *Officious*, told to get yourself or someone else out of trouble. Children often tell little officious lies, but they are usually only fibs, and not about anything serious. The third kind of lie is the worst: it is called *Malicious*, because it is told with malice in one's heart, and with the definite intention of doing someone a serious injury. It is almost impossible to believe that a Catholic can be guilty of such a thing as a malicious lie.

*False Suspicion.* Thinking evil of someone without sufficient cause or reason.

*Rash Judgement.* Bringing *False Suspicion* out of your mind and speaking it aloud with your lips.

Not every kind of suspicion is sinful. For instance, if you know someone is in the habit of telling lies, you would quite rightly be on your guard about believing anything he says. Again, you may see a man staggering along the street, and when he is near enough you may notice that his hat is on the back of his head, that he is talking foolishly to himself, and that there is a strong smell of beer about him. To suspect that such a man is tipsy would not be *False Suspicion*, and to say so would not be *Rash Judgement*; it would be merely common sense. You may sometimes think that parents, teachers, and policemen are suspicious. They are: but it is not a sinful suspicion, because it is part of their duty to be on the watch for mischief.

*Hypocrisy.* Pretending to be good whilst only hiding one's wickedness.

*Back-biting.* Speaking meanly of someone's faults in his absence.

*Tale-bearing.* Carrying tittle-tattle backwards and forwards in order to make mischief. If somebody brings you tales about another boy or girl, don't repeat them; they may be quite untrue, and you would be spreading lies. There is a strong text in the Bible (Eccles. xxi, 31) about the tale-bearer, "The tale-bearer shall defile his own soul, and shall be hated by all."

*Calumny.* Telling lies about our neighbour, and thus injuring his good name. In the Law Courts it is called *Slander*.

*Detraction.* Injuring our neighbour's character by revealing his secret faults.

If we calumniate someone we must make up for it by acknowledging that we have been telling lies about him, and thus help to restore his good name. If we detract him we shall find it very difficult to mend matters, because we have told the truth—but the secret truth; and all sins of this kind must be made up for somehow or other. If you know secret faults about someone, keep them to yourself; and if you get the chance speak nicely of him in order to keep the secret. Secrets are supposed to be kept. At the same time be sensible, and don't confuse sneaking with doing your duty. Should you discover, for instance, that someone is teaching evil to others, he is obviously making the evil public by spreading it; and as it is no longer a secret fault it is your duty to make it known to someone in authority in order to protect other people from harm. When difficulties arise about this kind of thing, ask the priest at Confession what you ought to do.

Here is a story about *Calumny*, *Detraction*, and the other sins that break the Eighth Commandment. When a certain lady was writing her life (she had led a bad life, but was converted) she said that she went to Confession to a holy priest (it was St. Philip Neri), telling him of how she had been guilty for many years of *Calumny* and *Detraction*, and of other spiteful talk. When she had finished her Confession she said to the priest: "Please, Father, give me a good hard penance, so that I shall remember how wicked I have been." "Very well, my Child, I will," he replied; and he gave her a penance that she never forgot for the rest of her life. "Go into the market-place," he said, "and buy a fowl with all the feathers on it. Then walk out into the country, and don't turn back until you have plucked out all the feathers." She thought that this was a very interesting and novel kind of penance, and she set out quite eagerly to do it. Even when you have the bird between your knees, and a bucket of water to help, it is not easy to pluck a fowl; and the lady in the story was walking all the time as she pulled out the feathers. It took her hours; and when she had at last finished it, she was miles and miles from home, and had to walk back again. However, she did it, but it made her very, very tired. Next morning she went to the Saint and said to him, as she held up the fowl in triumph by the legs: "There, Father, I've done my penance; but I shall never

forget it as long as I live." "Wait, my Child," replied the Saint, "you have done only half your penance so far. I want you to go back now, over the same road, and gather up all the feathers." The poor lady hung her head in shame, for she suddenly realized that it was as difficult for her to make up for all the sinful words that had flown from her lips for years as it was to collect all those feathers.

Be a sensible, straightforward, truthful child, not a gossip and a chatter-box. We can do much harm with our tongues, but we can do much good also. Let us use our God-given power of speech to be helpful to others, by speaking kindly of them and making excuses for them: this is protecting their good name, and making our own good name better. It is growing in virtue and the grace of God, as Holy Scripture says: "He that keepeth his mouth, keepeth his soul." As we saw in the Second Commandment, if we do not commit sin by the tongue, we shall commit very few sins at all, which means that we shall keep all God's Ten Commandments and certainly get to Heaven.

LAWRENCE HULL, C.S.S.R.

## NOTES ON RECENT WORK

### HOLY SCRIPTURE

WHILE the Battle of the Atlantic is, at the moment of writing, not yet decisively won, there is welcome proof in the frequent arrival of books and periodicals from the United States that the U-boats have waited in vain for such cargoes. Among recent arrivals the newly published American revision of the Challoner-Rheims version is quite the most important for a Catholic reader. The title page tells us that this edition of the *New Testament of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ* has been produced by Catholic scholars (twenty-seven of them, the preface states, though this reckoning does not include the two English-members of the board or the theological censors) under the patronage of the Episcopal Committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine.<sup>1</sup> As the joint work of many hands, it has moved along fairly briskly, even if five years have passed since the version was begun. It is, in every sense, a translation of the Vulgate, and not a direct rendering of the Greek original, and its importance is to be estimated in terms of the Pontifical Biblical Commission's decree of 30 April, 1934, which enacts that the vernacular rendering of the epistles and gospels to be read to the people must be based on the liturgical (that is the Vulgate) text, and not directly on the Hebrew, Aramaic or Greek originals.

It is necessary to recognize that this edition is, indeed, a revision of Challoner's text and is not, as Mgr. Knox's rendering is destined to be, a new version of the Vulgate. The principles governing the work of translation have been given wide publicity by means of the *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, and are briefly explained in the preface. Thus, while much that is old-fashioned and less accurate in Challoner's version has been set aside, a great part of the old rendering has been retained; "the close adherence to Latin sentence structure, so evident in his text, is not the usage of our time"; the variant readings of Wordsworth and White's *Novum Testamentum Latine* have been freely consulted; the underlying Greek or Semitic turn of phrase has often been detected beneath the veil of the Latin version; and the old verse divisions of Challoner have been abandoned in favour of the still older paragraphing of the Rheims-Douay Bible. Marginal titles and headings have been added, and quotations from the Old Testament have, for the most part, been inset, and, in the case of poetry, in a manner that reveals the parallelism of Hebrew verse forms.

There is, it will be noted with some relief, nothing ultra-modern about this new revision. Unlike Moffatt's translation, the present edition will not invite criticism by styling an elder a "sheik" or by describing Jacob's pottage as "a red omelet" (Cf. Moffatt's rendering of Gen. xxv, 30: "Esau said to Jacob, 'Let me have a bite of that red omelet there! I am famish-

<sup>1</sup> St. Anthony Guild Press, Paterson, New Jersey, 1941. Pp. viii + 762. Price in this country, one guinea, leatherette binding.

ing.”) “Thou” and “thee”, eliminated by Moffatt and the American version edited by the Protestant scholars Powis Smith and Goodspeed, are retained in all their occurrences here, as also by the earlier, quite excellent, if somewhat free, translation from the Greek by the late Fr. Francis Aloysius Spencer, O.P.<sup>1</sup> The notes, while fresh, up to date, and much more serviceable than Challoner’s, are brief and concise, and they in no sense take the place of the one-volume commentary which is, it is understood, in preparation.

A few points of detail may be mentioned in passing. It is good to see that the important word *diathêkê*, which occurs, in all, 33 times in the Greek New Testament, is correctly rendered “covenant”, except, of course, in Heb. ix, 16-17 and Gal. iii, 15, where it means “testament” in the sense of “last will and testament”. (“Old Testament” in II Cor. iii, 14, is scarcely a real exception; neither Moffatt nor any other prominent modernizer has so far succeeded in changing the titles of the Bible’s two main divisions into “Old Covenant” and “New Covenant”.) A note to Mk. vi, 26 recognizes with justice that the most likely sense of *atheteô* is here “to break faith with some one”. It is, however, regrettable that, in v. 20 of the same chapter, the curious phrase *multa faciebat*, which, like its Greek equivalent, suggests little to the mind, except perhaps Dryden’s line: “Was everything by starts and nothing long”, is literally translated without any note to remind us that the reading of the best Greek MSS. favours the rendering: “He was much troubled”. An opportunity of substituting a probable meaning for a less probable one was lost in the case of II Tim. iv, 7, where *fidem servavi* should have been translated: “I have kept faith” (and not, as here and in all existing versions: “I have kept *the* faith”).<sup>2</sup> It is much too early for any definitive assessment of the new version’s value and probable success, but it is quite clear that an abundance of patient labour has been expended on its production, and that this collective effort of American Catholic scholarship will not go unrewarded.

It is only too seldom that an opportunity comes of noticing two versions in the same series of notes, but a welcome must now be given to *The New Testament in Basic English* which, while its makers do not claim that it is a literary work rivalling the great versions, is at the very least a most interesting experiment.<sup>3</sup> Basic English, the invention of Mr. C. K. Ogden, is a much simplified form of the English language which, with only 850 words, is able to give the sense (I should prefer to say “the broad sense”) of anything that may be expressed in English. For the purpose of putting the Bible into Basic a slight addition of 150 words has been made; even so,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. THE CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. XIV, pp. 59-61.

<sup>2</sup> Those who are interested in the *subsidiaria interpretationis* may be referred to Adolf Deissmann’s *Light From the Ancient East*, English translation of 1927, pp. 308-10. Deissmann’s main point is that “faith” here is used in the sense of “loyalty”; it is not “the faith” in the sense of “creed”.

<sup>3</sup> Cambridge University Press, 1941. Pp. 461. Price in cloth, 3s. net; in leather cloth 3s. 6d. net. There is also a larger edition, set in paragraphs, at 8s. 6d. net.



this is a remarkable achievement, and it is astonishing that the anonymous translator has been able, so often, to hit the nail and spare his fingers. It was to be expected that, in not a few passages, delicate shades of meaning would be somewhat obscured owing to the lack of the technical, frequently latinized, vocabulary needed for their precise rendering. The oft-repeated advice to avoid using two words if one will serve must be understood unpedantically in such a version, in which periphrasis is frequently the only method of conveying anything approaching the sense of the original. One example out of many of not very successful periphrasis might be the glorious opening verse of Heb. c. iii, rendered in the new American edition: "Therefore, holy brethren, partakers of a heavenly calling, consider the apostle and high priest of our confession, Jesus . . ." This becomes in the Basic text: "For this reason, holy brothers, marked out to have a part in heaven, give thought to Jesus the representative and High Priest of our faith". Here something is undeniably lost both in beauty and precision, though it is only fair to say that, in many other cases, perhaps the majority of the verses in the New Testament, nothing, or next to nothing, is sacrificed. The Basic experiment is a praiseworthy one, and, since many people imitate Lord Macaulay's habit of beginning with the New Testament in their efforts to acquire a foreign language, this version will be of great service to those foreigners who wish to learn the most essential words in English and to study their approximate use in a familiar text. But if any intelligent foreigner expects to get a clear conception of the marvellous range, undeniable beauty and perhaps matchless subtlety of our English language from a text written in Basic he will, quite inevitably, be disappointed, and may be recommended to turn, by way of contrast, to some such text as I Tim. vi in the Rheims Version of 1582.

I have only two complaints about Mr. H. V. Morton's delightful book *Middle East*,<sup>1</sup> and neither is a reasonable criticism of the author or his methods. In the first place, I have read most of it already in the pages of the three earlier books from which a selection has been made, namely *In the Steps of the Master*, *In the Steps of St. Paul*, and *Through Lands of the Bible*. I am only too happy to read them again, but I still wish I were reading them for the first time, and in their complete setting. In the present compressed abridgement they seem sadly foreshortened. Secondly, owing to the rearrangement of the chapters, the first nine sections deal with Egypt under a very hot sun, and they are not the most agreeable reading in the midst of a heat-wave. Jerusalem, too, is altogether too sunny for real comfort at a time when all one's thoughts are concentrated upon iced drinks, cool grots and Arctic exploration. It is only when we reach p. 149 and are heartened by the first sentence, apropos of the desert journey to Baghdad: "The air, already chilled at sunset, had a touch of ice in it", that we begin to realize that the book has undeniable charm. "What is the exact secret of Mr. Morton's great success as a recorder of travels?"

<sup>1</sup> London, Methuen, 1941. Pp. ix + 326. Price 8s. 6d.

would be a splendid subject for a prize essay. Equally pleasant people have made equally painstaking discoveries in the Near East, and their reveries, reflections and chunks of solid history are now presumably being pulped down at a time when the only Britishers who are exploring the East are fighting men "with serviceable weapons in their hands", as the Prime Minister put it. Perhaps one secret of Mr. Morton's success is that his books, even when he is describing the fetid, bat-haunted atmosphere inside the Great Pyramid, are essentially open-air books. Like most successful journalists, he has had to read widely in order to appreciate his subjects, but, in contrast to the work of many other travellers, there is no smell of the lamp and not even a glimpse of those horrid figures, the abstract, the skeleton, and the *précis*. He does not spare an unlimited amount of space for those descriptions of scenery which so many well-intentioned people tend to skip, and (a very important point in books on countries associated with the Bible) he has a deeply religious appreciation of the Holy Land and all that it has meant to mankind. Have many, if any, good books on Palestine been written by those wholly without religion? Probably very few. All the most remarkable ones seem to have been produced by adherents of one of Palestine's three faiths: Christianity, Judaism and Islam. In this selection, as it happens, not many pages (only thirty-five in all) are concerned with the Holy Land. Nearly three hundred remain, and these are grouped under the main headings of Egypt, Iraq, Turkey and Greece. The impressions of Istanbul and of Greece did not appear in the earlier volumes, and are printed here for the first time.

Another recent book by Mr. Morton is entitled *Women of the Bible*,<sup>1</sup> and contains a series of short chapters, twenty-three in all, which range in their subject-matter from Eve to St. Mary Magdalene. All of them are thoughtful and interesting, and a good deal of the author's knowledge of the East is reflected in these pages. But it cannot be pretended that Mr. Morton is as successful here as in his travel books. In the latter he is a master who far surpasses his contemporaries; in the present book he is much nearer to the general run of competent writers on subjects connected with Holy Scripture.

JOHN M. T. BARTON.

<sup>1</sup> London, Methuen, Pp. 176. Price 5s.

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

### CASES RESERVED TO THE ORDINARY

What is the sense to be given to the words of Canon 883 §2, "etiam a casibus Ordinario loci reservatis"? (W. P.)

#### REPLY

Canon 883 §2: Quoties vero navis in itinere consistat, possunt confessiones excipere tum fidelium qui quavis de causa ad navim accedant, tum eorum qui ipsis ad terram obiter appellantis confiteri petant, eosque valide ac licite absolvere etiam a casibus Ordinario loci reservatis.

The obscurity arises because the words may be taken in two senses. They can mean the cases reserved *propter censuram* which the common law of the Code reserves to Ordinaries; or they can mean those cases, generally *propter peccatum*, which Ordinaries may reserve to their own tribunal, from Canons 893 seq., in addition to those which are already reserved to them by the common law.

The commentators do not usually discuss this point, and the two we have consulted do not agree. Fr. C. Berutti, O.P., writes in *Jus Pontificium*, 1934, xiv, p. 66: "Manifeste patet proinde quod agitur exclusive de casibus, quos ibidem Ordinarius loci sibi ipse reservaverit (ad normam can. 893 et seqq.): quorum sane notitiam, ut plurimum, habere nequeunt. Ceterum, si comprehenderentur etiam censurae quae iure communi Ordinario loci reservantur, explicari non posset, cur eadem facultas sacerdotibus navigantibus non tribuatur etiam in can. 883 §1. Itaque, a casibus iure communi reservatis, itemque a censuris ab homine inflictis, sacerdotes navigantes absolvere nequeunt, nisi servatis praescriptis quae in iure communi ad rem generaliter statuuntur."

Fr. Vermeersch, S.J., on the other hand, writing in *Periodica*, 1930, xix, p. 119, holds that both classes of reservations are included in Canon 883 §2: "... valide et licite absolvere possunt a casibus Ordinario loci reservatis: sive reservatio ista a iure vel ab ipso Ordinario procedat. Haec est enim naturalis et consueta vis verborum 'a casibus Ordinario loci reservatis'."

In our view, the interpretation of Fr. Berutti is to be preferred, particularly as the document on which the law of this canon is based<sup>1</sup> reads "a casibus Ordinario loci *forte* reservatis", a phrase which has no exact meaning except for reservations which the Ordinary has himself added to those of the common law. The opinion of Fr. Vermeersch may, nevertheless, be followed as at least probable: it is a *dubium iuris* and jurisdiction is supplied from Canon 209.

E. J. M.

CAPED CASSOCK

Two types of cassock are worn by priests in this country, the one with and the other without a cape. Which is the more correct? Or are both types tolerated? (P. J.)

<sup>1</sup>S. Off. 13 December, 1906, *Fontes*, n. 1281.

REPLY

Canon 136 §1: Omnes clerici decentem habitum ecclesiasticum, secundum legitimas locorum consuetudines et Ordinarii loci praescripta, deferant. . . .

Canon 811 §1: Sacerdos, Missam celebraturus, deferat vestem convenientem quae ad talos pertingat et sacra ornamenta. . . .

IV Westm., Dec., XI, n. 12: Formam illam (habitus) commendamus, quae paucis abhinc annis a clero saeculari adhiberi coepit. Domi vero habitum taltarem, vel, si magis placet, cum qui zimarra appellatur, cum bireto, induere eos maxime decet.

Dr. McReavy writing in this REVIEW, 1937, XIII, p. 82, proved that the cassock is not the legitimate customary clerical outdoor dress of clerics in this country. The Westminster decree declares it to be a fitting garment to be worn in the house, and the common law everywhere requires it at the celebration of Mass. The question, therefore, is concerned with the correct shape of this cassock worn at home or at Mass.

Mgr. Ward in *The Sequel to Catholic Emancipation*, Vol. II, p. 272, relates that the Roman capeless cassock with sash was introduced by certain priests as an external sign of their loyalty to the Holy See, and as a corrective to what they considered the singular and non-Roman style of caped garment in vogue. He points out, however, that the caped cassock was expressly authorized by Pope Pius IX for the English clergy. "Tell them," the Pope is reported to have said to Wiseman, "to wear the same dress as I do, only black instead of white."

The sash accompanying this caped cassock has never, we think, been the custom except amongst the Oblates of St. Charles and some other communities. But it is certainly the custom of numbers of priests to use a non-caped cassock and, it appears, this kind is becoming commoner than the caped sort—for one thing, it is less expensive. The law is observed, on the occasions when a cassock is ordered, by wearing either sort, unless the Ordinary has determined its shape more exactly.

E. J. M.

FACULTIES OF SEMINARY RECTOR

May the rector of a seminary, who is accompanying some of his students on a pilgrimage outside the diocese, hear their confessions, if no other confessor is available? Parish priests enjoy this power, and it would seem that the seminary rector should also have it. (W. E.)

REPLY

Canon 1368. Exemptum a iurisdictione paroeciali Seminarium esto; et pro omnibus qui in Seminario sunt, parochi officium, excepta materia matrimoniali et firmo praescripto can. 891, obeat Seminarii rector eiusve delegatus, nisi in quibusdam Seminariis fuerit aliter a Sede Apostolica constitutum.

Vol. xxi

M

Canon 891. Magister novitiorum eiusque socius, Superior Seminariorum collegiive sacramentales confessiones suorum alumnorum secum in eadem domo commorantium ne audiant, nisi alumni ex gravi et urgenti causa in casibus particularibus sponte id petant.

Canon 873, §1. Ordinaria iurisdictione ad confessiones excipiendas potuntur pro suo quisque territorio Ordinarius loci, et parochus aliqui qui loco parochi sunt.

Canon 881, §2. Qui ordinariam habent absolvendi potestatem, possunt subditos absolvere ubique terrarum.

If it is decided that the rector of a seminary possesses ordinary jurisdiction for hearing the confessions of his subjects, it will immediately follow that, for urgent reasons, he may absolve them wherever they may happen to be. Whilst they are in the seminary the point is rather theoretical than practical, since the rector will certainly enjoy, like all the clergy of the diocese, at least delegated jurisdiction from the Ordinary.

(i) Many commentators, including some on whom we are most accustomed to rely, such as Cappello, *De Poenitentia* (1938), §§ 387, 480, deny emphatically that the seminary rector possesses ordinary jurisdiction for confessions. It is, they consider, almost absurd to say that a person possesses ordinary jurisdiction and is at the same time forbidden to exercise it except in urgent cases. In seminaries confessional jurisdiction is enjoyed by the ordinary and extraordinary confessors as provided for in Canon 1361. Nothing certain can be deduced from the fact that the seminary is extra-parochial, since no mention is made of the rector in Canon 451, §2, dealing with persons who are equivalent to a parish priest; moreover, as in Canon 464, §2, the Ordinary may withdraw a religious house from the care of the local parish priest and appoint a chaplain for the care of souls therein, but no one can maintain that this chaplain possesses ordinary jurisdiction.

(ii) Those canonists, however, who have made a more detailed examination of the question, notably Ciprotti in *Apollinaris*, 1935, p. 282, and Onclin in *Jus Pontificium*, 1936, p. 70, are equally certain that the seminary rector does enjoy ordinary jurisdiction, and we think their view is correct. For the restriction in Canon 891 is on the *use* of his powers, and the fact that he is forbidden to use them except in certain contingencies argues that he possesses them; otherwise it would have to be said, we suppose, that jurisdiction is conferred by the student who for urgent reasons approaches the rector for confession. That the law provides for confessors, ordinary and extraordinary, in seminaries, arises from the desire of the modern legislator that the faithful should have abundant facilities for going to confession. The seminary rector is not mentioned in Canon 451, §2, because he is not fully equivalent to a parish priest, since he enjoys no power for assisting at marriages, whereas the others mentioned in that canon are fully equivalent. It is true that the chaplain of an extra-parochial religious house has no ordinary jurisdiction; but there is no reason for supposing that he has got it, whereas very good reasons exist in the wording of Canon 1368 for supposing that the seminary rector has.

(iii) In any case, it is evident that Canon 209 can be invoked in the *dubium iuris*, and the answer to the above question is thereby affirmative, not only in the application of Canon 881, §2, but as regards any other equivalent powers as in Canon 899, §3.

E. J. M.

CATECHUMEN AS SPONSOR

When about to perform the rite of solemn baptism, the priest finds that the person acting as sponsor is under instruction and not yet received into the Church. May he be admitted as a valid sponsor? (E. O.)

REPLY

Canon 762, §1. Ex vetustissimo Ecclesiae more nemo sollemniter baptizetur, nisi suum habeat, quatenus fieri potest, patrinum.

Canon 765. Ut quis sit patrinus, oportet: (1) Sit baptizatus. . . . (2) Ad nullam pertineat haeticam aut schismaticam sectam.

Canon 1239, §2. Catechumeni qui nulla sua culpa sine baptismo moriantur, baptizatis accensendi sunt.

Some slight reason exists, perhaps, for supposing that a catechumen may act validly as sponsor, from the last canon cited, which, for the purposes of ecclesiastical burial, regards a catechumen as being equivalent to a baptized person—there is clearly baptism of desire in such cases.

But it seems to us quite certain, though we cannot find a post-code author who discusses the point, that the rule of Canon 1239, §2, which is made for a definite contingency, cannot be regarded as a general principle. De Smet, writing just before the Code, and citing c. 102, Dist. IV *De Consecratione*, notes that the decree says nothing about the validity of the action; but he continues: "sub poena tamen nullitatis auctores passim exigunt characterem baptismalem in susceptore, idque merito, cum absurdum censeatur patrem spiritualem esse illum qui spiritu nondum est natus". This teaching is quite explicit in Canon 765, where all the conditions enumerated are necessary for the validity of the act, and which is contrasted with the following Canon 766 which determines the conditions required only for its lawfulness. Pre-Code law did not clearly distinguish the two things.

If it be urged that very likely the catechumen is already validly baptized, he is still incapable of being a valid sponsor from Canon 765.2. Nor may it be said that he is no longer a member of an heretical sect, since he has renounced it by putting himself under instructions; for the law regards him as pertaining to the sect until he abjures and is absolved from the censure, at least *ad cautelam*, during the rite of reception into the Church.

In the circumstances, if no valid sponsor is obtainable, the rite should be performed without one, rather than run the risk of depriving the candidate of baptism. The phrase "quatenus fieri potest" in Canon 762, §1, implies that the presence of a sponsor at solemn baptism is not a *conditio sine qua non*. Cf. also *S.C. de Propaganda Fide*, 1 April, 1816: "An, cum valde difficile hic sit invenire patrilinos quales Ecclesia requirit, Baptismus licite conferatur sine patrilinis. R. Si patrilini haberi non possunt, absque patrilinis non necessariis necessarium Baptisma conferendum."<sup>1</sup>

E. J. M.

<sup>1</sup>Fontes, n. 4701.

## BLESSING OF AN INFANT'S GRAVE

The rite *De Exequiis* provides a form for blessing the grave, if the cemetery is not already blessed or consecrated. But the *Ordo Sepeliendi Parvulos* contains no similar form, and the one in *De Exequiis* is so worded as to apply only to adults. What should be done in these circumstances? (E. O.)

## REPLY

A reply S.R.C. 4 September, 1880, n. 3524, 1.2, directs that nothing at all is to be done beyond what the Ritual directs for the burial of infants: "Quid de benedictione Sepulcri parvulorum? An scilicet in omni casu omittenda erit, sive parvuli sepeliantur in Coemeterio iam antea benedicto, sive sepeliantur in coemeterio non prius benedicto; et si omitti non debet, quomodo talis benedictio facienda erit? *Resp.* Satis esse servare quae a Rituali Romano praescribuntur."

The reply appears, at first sight, to be in conflict with Canon 1205, §1, which directs the bodies of the faithful to be placed in a blessed cemetery. But it may be noticed that the rubric n. 3 in *Ordo Sepeliendi Parvulos* provides for the blessing of the child's grave with holy water and incense, though there is no accompanying form of words; nor is there any rubric similar to that in *De Exequiis* directing the sprinkling and incensation to be omitted if the grave is already blessed. We can find no explanation of this, but it may conceivably be connected in some way with the rule of Canon 1209, §3, that infants should be buried in a separate and special portion of the cemetery.

E. J. M.

## BAPTISMAL CEREMONIES

(i) Neither the *Roman Ritual* nor our *Ordo Administrandi* state the exact time of entry into the baptistery. Is it more correct to make the interrogations *N. Credis in Deum*, etc., within the gates of the baptistery? (W.)

(ii) A query has arisen in observing the law of supplying the omitted ceremonies, as explained in the June issue (1941), p. 544: the growth of hair on the head of an adult makes it difficult to anoint the crown of the head: should it be done in such cases on the forehead? (B.)

## REPLY

(ad. i) It is true that the *Ordo Administrandi* (1915), which is based on the official text of the *Roman Ritual* then current, does not make it quite clear. The commentators solved the doubt by quoting the very explicit directions contained in *Memoriale Rituum*, Tit. vi, cap. ii, §5, namely, the priest pronounces the exorcisms standing with his back to the entrance of



the baptistery; in the same place he puts on the white stole, enters the baptistery and, standing before the font, puts the questions *N. Credis in Deum*, etc.

These rubrics are now included in the latest (1925) typical edition of the *Roman Ritual*: 12. *Ac deinde, antequam accedat ad Baptisterium, versis renibus ostio cancellorum Baptisterii, dicit Exorcizo te*, etc. 17. *Stans ibidem extra cancellos, deponit stolam violaceam, et sumit stolam albi coloris. Tunc ingreditur Baptisterium, in quod intrat etiam patrinus cum infante. Sacerdos ad fontem interrogat*, etc.

(ad. ii) *Rituale Romanum*, Tit. II, cap. v, n. 21: *Sacerdos intingit pollicem in sacro Chrismate, et ungit infantem (quem patrinus vel matrina, vel uterque simul tenet) in summitate capitis in modum crucis dicens (singulariter singulis): Deus omnipotens*, etc.

Although we have not been able to find any writer dealing expressly with this point, a solution of the doubt may be found by examining the analogous situation in pouring the baptismal water on the hairy head of a candidate. The *Roman Ritual* does not, indeed, specify on what part of the head the water is to be poured, and everyone admits some element of doubt if it flows merely over the hair without anywhere touching the skin. But the bracketed instruction in our own *Ordo Administrandi*, Tit. II, cap. i, n. 10, is more explicit: "*Abluenda est pars capitis superior. Sedulo curandum est ut pellem capitis aqua immediate tangat. Quod si capillatus fuerit qui baptizandus occurrit, densius capillamentum discriminet Sacerdos sinistrae manus digitis cum aquam dextra infundit*." Hence two methods are suggested: the water may be poured on the crown of the head in such wise that it flows also on the forehead; or the pouring may begin on the forehead and continue on to the crown of the head.<sup>1</sup>

Similarly, though the matter is not of the same gravity, it would seem that the anointing of a hairy candidate should be performed by making a large sign of the cross so as to include, if the hair cannot be parted, the forehead or the sides of the head.

E. J. M.

#### MASS WITHOUT ANYONE PRESENT

In Volume XVIII, 1940, p. 310, it is stated that the faculty granted to Army chaplains, permitting them to celebrate without a server, does not mean that they may do so without anyone at all present. Could it not be said that the opposite and more liberal interpretation is at least probable? (X.)

#### REPLY

Readers of this journal will have noticed that we always try, if possible, to give a liberal solution to the doubts and problems presented, and the

<sup>1</sup>*Collationes Brugenses*, 1927, p. 103; Dunne, *Ritual Explained* (4th ed.), pp. 6 and 22.

Army chaplain is particularly entitled to any justifiable interpretation of the law which will make smooth his difficult path. We have, therefore, made another investigation of all the available commentaries on Canon 813 and *De Defectibus*, X, 1, and have found only one writer—an anonymous contributor to the (American) *Ecclesiastical Review*, 1919, X, p. 550—who favours the liberal view to some extent: "The same reasons," he writes, "which allow a priest to dispense with a server also permit the celebration of Mass without any other person present in the church." It will be observed, however, that he is not commenting on the meaning of an indult permitting Mass "*absque ministro inserviente*", as in n. 7 of the faculties, but simply applying the common principle that no positive law binds *sub gravi incommodo*; that is to say, any priest would be entitled to say Mass not only without a server but with no one present, if it were necessary—for example, in order to give viaticum to the dying. There is no doubt whatever that Army chaplains may often be confronted with this emergency, in which case they would rightly say Mass alone, even though the permission to celebrate without a server were not contained in the faculties.

All the other writers we have consulted do not advert to the point: they discuss the reasons permitting the absence of a server, and appear to take it for granted that there will be some other persons present. The only commentary we have seen on the current faculties is that by Fr. Bergh, S.J., in *N.R.T.*, 1940, p. 296, who, likewise, does not mention the point.

The following are the reasons which lead us, with regret, to adopt the stricter view. Indults similar to that contained in n. 7 of the faculties are often obtained by individuals, and an example may be seen in *Periodica*, 1923, XII, p. 43: "... benigne indulsit (S. Rituum Congregatio) ut, ob defectum ministri et in casu necessitatis supradictus sacerdos religiosus et parochus celebrare valeat missam sine ministro. Curet tamen idem orator habere aliquem puerum vel famulum quem instruat saltem pro responsis celebranti, aut saltem aliquem virum aut mulierem qui intersit sacrosancti missae sacrificio et populum repraesentet." It is clear that this indult to celebrate without a server does not mean celebrating alone; Vermeersch states that all similar rescripts contain this clause,<sup>1</sup> and we think that n. 7 of the faculties must be interpreted, as stated in Canon 20, "*a stylo et praxi Curiae Romanae*".

There is no reason, indeed, why persons should not obtain indults permitting them to celebrate entirely alone, outside the cases of urgent necessity which the commentators have always permitted. But this is rather unusual, whereas faculties for celebrating without a server are common and are included in the customary formula issued by *Propaganda* for missionary countries. An example of the wider faculty was cited in this REVIEW, 1931, II, p. 286. If the Holy See desired to concede this ampler kind of faculty to Army chaplains, it seems to us that the wording of the text would have been so framed instead of the more restricted wording of n. 7, "*absque ministro inserviente*".

The Editor would welcome any arguments from readers who think that the above solution is too strict; foreign commentaries on the faculties are not easily obtainable, but there are to be found, perhaps, some official

<sup>1</sup>*Theologia Moralis*, III, §323.

explanations of the similar faculty granted 16 December, 1916, by Benedict XV during the last war; or, very probably, some Army chaplains may have received an authoritative interpretation from their own military Ordinaries. We are not only willing but anxious to accept the more liberal view, if arguments or authorities can be cited in favour of its probability.

E. J. M.

PERICULUM MATRIMONII CIVILIS

This is the canonical cause most frequently alleged by the priest applying for a dispensation from the impediment of *mixed religion*. Is it verified when the priest considers that, in the circumstances, it would be a very grave hardship for the parties to abandon the marriage? (E. O.)

REPLY

*S.C. de Propaganda Fide*, 9 May, 1877, n. 13: "*Periculum matrimonii civilis*. Ex dictis consequitur, probabile periculum quod illi, qui dispensationem petunt, ea non obtenta, matrimonium dumtaxat *civile*, ut aiunt, celebraturi sint, esse legitimam dispensandi causam." This document, which sets out all the sixteen "canonical" causes, is the *locus classicus* on the subject.<sup>1</sup> Cappello adds a further list of fifteen causes, many of which are admitted in practice by the Holy See and may, therefore, rightly be called "canonical".<sup>2</sup>

(i) It suffices if the danger of civil marriage is considered to be probable. The priest from his knowledge of the parties must be able truthfully to assert that this is so, and it is clearly not permitted him to construe every case of grave hardship, if the dispensation is refused, as being always equivalent to the danger of a civil marriage. All cases of refusal entail severe disappointment and resentment; if, in addition, it is judged that the parties will take a refusal so badly that they will probably get married in a registry office, the canonical cause is verified. Otherwise it is not, and there must be many cases in which the danger is improbable, because the Catholic petitioner is a faithful and loyal member of the Church, who would never go to the length of contracting a civil marriage. In such cases one or more of the remaining canonical causes must be cited: "*operae pretium erit imprimis animadvertere, unam aliquando causam seorsim acceptam insufficientem esse, sed alteri adiunctam sufficientem existimari: nam quae non prosunt singula, multa iuvant.*"<sup>3</sup>

(ii) Since the quinquennial faculties obtained from the Holy See leave it to the discretion of the Ordinary whether he will use them or not, one must know his requirements, and local legislation frequently makes more explicit the sort of causes which must be verified before a dispensation from *mixed religion* will be considered. It is true that this impediment is not *diriment* of marriage; on the other hand, the faith of the Catholic party or of the offspring is always endangered to some extent, though made more

<sup>1</sup> *Fontes*, n. 4890.

<sup>2</sup> *De Matrimonio* (1939), §268.

<sup>3</sup> *S.C. de Prop. Fide, loc. cit.*

remote by the guarantees, and the multiplication of these unions is likely to result in a general religious laxity; therefore canonical causes which might suffice for other impediments, even diriment impediments, are not necessarily held to be adequate in the case of *mixed religion*. It is almost the universal impression that the allegation is too lightly made that there is fear of a civil marriage, and the Ordinary is not only entitled, but strictly bound, to satisfy himself that it is not fictitious; otherwise his dispensation will be invalid from Canon 84, §1.

E. J. M.

## ROMAN DOCUMENTS

### (i) EPISTULAE

#### I

AD ENIM P. D. DYONISIUM TIT. SS. NEREI ET ACHILLEI S. R. E. PRESB. CARDINALEM DOUGHERTY, ARCHIEPISCOPUM PHILADELPHIENSEM, QUINQUAGESIMUM AB INITO SACERDOTIO ANNUM FELICITER EXPLENTEM. (*A.A.S.* xxxii, 1940, p. 485.)

#### PIUS PP. XII

Dilecte Fili Noster, salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.—Perquam gratum nuntium recens accepimus, te quinquagesimum ab inito sacerdotio annum proxime esse celebraturum. Haec enim sacri eventus commemoratio praeclaram confert opportunitatem tibi Nostram existimationem ac benevolentiam rursus patefaciendi, simulque tuam tuorumque laetitiam intima Nostra participatione cumulandi. Egregia profecto ac permulta sunt tua in Ecclesiam promerita, quibus, tum in flore aetatis munere clericos docendi perfungens, tum praesertim episcopale officium persolvens, luculenter enituiti. Sollertem autem frugiferamque pastorem industriam mirifice exhibuisti primo in regendis Novae Segoviae et Sanctae Elisabeth dioecesis, in Insulis Philippinis exstantibus, ubi plures rerum difficultates prudenter feliciterque superasti, deinde vero in Ecclesia Buffalensi ac denique in sede ista metropolitana, cui iam viginti duos annos actuose moderaris. In comperto est inter cetera, novas istic conditas dioeceses, paroccias et puerorum scholas, itemque clericorum adolescentium, presbyterorum familiarumque religiosarum numerum peractum. Illud sane peculiari tuae laudi est ducendum, te summo studio atque alacritate adlaborare, ut ii, quos ad officia sacra instruendos curas, sive in Seminariis dioecesanis, sive heic Romae apud Cathedram Sancti Petri, rite solideque instituatur. Sunt enimvero iuvenes clerici recte instituti non modo certa meliorum temporum spes, sed etiam praeclara sacrorum Antistitum corona et gloria. Hasce laudes tuas plane perspectas habuerunt Decessores Nostri, inter quos Benedictus XV felicitis recordationis, qui te ad Principum Ecclesiae Senatum cooptavit, et Pius XI recentis ac veneratae memoriae, qui Legatum Suum a latere ad Congressum Eucharisticum ex omni natione Manilae habitum te deligere benigne voluit. Nos autem, qui tuam erga Apostolicam Sedem et Christi Vicarium fidelitatem dilectionemque probe novimus, tibi, Dilecte Fili Noster, ob sacrum munus industrie fructuoseque hoc diuturno tempore gestum vehementer gratulamur, a Deo admota prece ominantes, ut ipse integris corporis animique viribus diu vivas ac floreas, ista circumdatus corona filiorum, quibus tanta beneficia contulisti. Quo autem sacerdotalis iubilaei sollemnia uberiores salutis fructus populo tuo afferre queant, tibi facultatem damus, ut, constituta die, post Sacrum pontificali ritu peractum, adstantibus fidelibus nomine Nostro Nostraque auctoritate benedicas, plenariam indulgentiam iisdem proponens, ad Ecclesiae praescripta lucranda. Supernorum interea donorum nuntia et conciliatrix, praecipuaeque Nostrae caritatis testis esto Apostolica Bene-

dictio, quam tibi, Dilecte Fili Noster, Episcopo Auxiliari tuo universoque clero populoque tuæ curæ demandato amantissime in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romæ apud Sanctum Petrum, die xv mensis Aprilis, anno MDCCCXLI, Pontificatus Nostri secundo.

PIUS PP. XII

## II

AD EMUM P. D. IOSEPHUM TIT. S. IOANNIS AD PORTAM LATINAM S. R. E. PRESBYTERUM CARDINALEM MAC RORY, ARCHIEPISCOPUM ARMACHANUM, ANNUM A SUSCEPTO EPISCOPATU QUINTUM ET VIGESIMUM CELEBRATURUM. (*A.A.S.* xxxii, 1940, p. 486.)

PIUS PP. XII

Dilecte Fili Noster, salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.—Certiores nuper facti sumus, te quinque ab inito episcopatu lustra proxime esse peracturum. Hæc profecto sacri eventus faustitas iucundissimam Nobis præbet occasionem, ut tecum paterne conlaetetur ac benevolentiam, qua te semper prosequuti sumus, publice libenterque confirmemus. Comperita est enimvero sollicitudo pastoralis, qua primum in ditione Dunensi et Connorensi ac deinde in prænobili ista metropolitana sede ad animarum salutem fovendam tuendamque incubuisti. Nota pariter est sincera fides atque in Deum pietas istius populi, quem intima caritatis coniunctione tibi habes devinctum. Quare, Dilecte Fili Noster, præclara tua erga Ecclesiam promerita paterna laude, exornantes, gratulationes tibi Nostras palam studioseque declaramus, sacrique eventus celebrationem fervidis votis omnibusque participamus. Hoc sane eo libentius facimus, quod tuam erga Apostolicam Sedem fidelitatem ac venerationem plane cognitam habemus; neque vero dubitamus, quin ex iubilæi episcopalis faustitate novas etiam vires sumpturus sis ad maiora in dies pro grege tibi commisso prosequenda. Quo autem proxima sollemnia utiliora fidelibus istis evadant, tibi ultro facultatem tribuimus, ut, statuta die, post Sacrum pontificali ritu peractum, adstanti populo nomine Nostro Nostraque auctoritate benedicas, plenariam eidem indulgentiam proponens ad Ecclesiæ præscripta lucrandam. Denique tibi ipsi, iam iam octogesimum ætatis annum feliciter acturo, saluberrima quæque ac iucundissima ominamur, Deum instantur rogantes, ut te supernorum solaciorum copia longum adhuc in ævum servet ac tueatur, fideliumque tibi obsequium atque amorem magis magisque conciliet. Quarum caelestium gratiarum nuntia et conciliatrix, præcipuæque Nostræ dilectionis testis sit Apostolica Benedictio, quam tibi, Dilecte Fili Noster, ac universo clero et populo tibi tradito amantissime in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romæ, apud Sanctum Petrum, die xv mensis Iulii anno MDCCCXLI, Pontificatus Nostri secundo.

PIUS PP. XII

## CHURCH MANAGEMENT

### PROCESSIONS

ANY insignificant individual becomes invested with courtly dignity when he takes part in a religious procession, and it is easy to understand how the Church adopted this common form of ceremonial expression. Our liturgical processions developed from the Stations which included two processional incidents, the papal procession to the church, and the procession from the sacristy to the sanctuary. Many of us who assisted at the Mass of thanksgiving in Westminster Cathedral, during the celebrations of the centenary of Catholic Emancipation, were stirred to imagine the restrained grandeur of ancient Roman ceremonial when, on passing through the great doors, the fine procession of clergy was greeted by the distant chanting of the litany as the late Cardinal and his procession advanced from the sacristies. Some of us may have been moved to realize that we did not make enough of processions. The importance which the Church attaches to them is evidenced by her insistence that certain of her liturgical observances must be accompanied by a procession of some kind. Thus, a procession, no matter how simple it may be, should always follow the blessing of candles at Candlemas.

A distinction must be drawn between liturgical processions in the strict sense, and the little devotional exercises to which we apply the same term: it would not be incorrect to describe the former as public and the latter as private.

Besides those processions which are an integral part of the solemn functions of such occasions as Candlemas, Palm Sunday, the last three days of Holy Week, the Rogation Days and Corpus Christi, any procession to and from the sanctuary has a right to be described as liturgical. The same applies to the procession of the Asperges. These sidelines of the liturgy are worth doing well; exactitude in externals undoubtedly contributes towards interior reverence, and additional solemnities make for a greater appreciation of the mystical and doctrinal significance of the feasts. The late Abbot Vonier taught that the parish priest who gives his people a great Christmas, a glorious Easter and a splendid Corpus Christi is a first-class liturgist, though he may press into service methods old and new.

In the spirit of this teaching we might return to the sacristy after High Mass in procession headed by the cross-bearer, through the body of the church: on such grand occasions as Christmas, Easter and Pentecost we might go in procession outside the building, if the planning permits, through the precincts, and enter by the main doors. A procession of this kind can be rendered most impressive if the servers be taught to sing an appropriate carol or hymn; *O filii et filiae* and *Veni Creator*, for example. A sufficient number of parishioners can always be found to accompany the priest around the church, inside or outside, for the chanting of the



Rogation litanies, and this may be done in the evening if practical considerations rule out the traditional morning observance.

Our own little unofficial, or non-liturgical, processions, always a popular feature in May devotions, far from being despised, should be encouraged; but with discretion. These processions exercise a valuable influence over the minds and imaginations of children. One has only to gaze on little boys and girls arrayed in their processional finery to recapture something of the feelings of awe and self-importance which possessed one's own juvenile being in similar circumstances. But processions are good for adults also; provided that they be not overdone, they are always an attraction, and evening service is always better attended on procession nights. It may be that they meet that need for joyous expression in religious life which formerly found an outlet in devotional dances.

Processions are a kind of religious game, but discretion and vigilance is needed for fear lest they decline into making a game of religion. Everything tainted with theatricalism should be avoided; and in this connection surely the practice of dressing up small children to represent well-known saints or members of religious orders is at least in questionable taste. Similarly, flower-strewing before the Blessed Sacrament, a custom which is not at all necessary but merely tolerated, need not be accompanied by curious contortions of foreign importation and reminiscent of the French ballet.

J. P. R.

## BOOK REVIEWS

*A Concise History of Italy.* By Luigi Salvatorelli. Translated by Bernard Miall. Demy 8vo. Pp. 688. (George Allen & Unwin, 21s.)

*Pre-Fascist Italy.* By Margot Hentze. Demy 8vo. Pp. 400. (George Allen & Unwin. 16s.)

TO attempt to cram the story of Italy from prehistoric times to our own day into less than seven hundred pages is something of a daring exploit. History, thus foreshortened, tends to become a mere catalogue of dates, names and events. Professor Salvatorelli, despite the fact that his studies over the whole range of Italian history fit him well for the task, and that in this single volume he has compressed the substance of his much larger work, *Storia d'Italia*, has not altogether escaped this danger. Yet there is enough detail and enough generalization in these twenty rapid chapters to make this book a useful guide to Italian history. The author cannot altogether conceal his anti-Papal leanings, especially in the modern period, yet on the whole his work is objective, and the book has the merit of including a very substantial Bibliography in which Catholic studies such as those of M. Mollat on the Papacy and Father Cuthbert on the Capuchins are given prominence. One wonders whether it is his own sympathies or the political necessities of the moment which make the author devote a disproportionate amount of space to the principles and aims of Fascism. The translation is far from perfect—"Cavour's policy was as clairvoyant as it was audacious" is but one example—and there are far too many misprints, especially in the Bibliography.

Miss Hentze's book is a notable piece of historical work, based on wide knowledge, amply documented, and written with insight and, on the whole, just perception. She surveys the political history of Italy, and its reaction on the Italian mind, between the two occupations of Rome—by Cadorna in 1870, and by the Fascisti, after the famous march, in 1922. In spite of intense enthusiasm and romantic visions, or perhaps because of these, Italian unity was achieved in an atmosphere of unreality. It was a forced growth, cultivated too rapidly amid the fear of foreign attack and of internal disintegration. Italy was not suited to a system of parliamentary government based on parties, and Miss Hentze brings out clearly the growing sense of frustration and despair which pervaded the people, not only because of failures in foreign affairs but especially because of the petty quarrels and intrigues which disfigured domestic government. She analyses well the Italian reasons for throwing in their lot with the Allies in 1915, and seems generous to Italy with regard to her claims at the Peace Conference. There is no doubt that the result of the Conference was to accentuate the sense of frustration in Italy and to prepare for the Fascist triumph.

Miss Hentze seems to me to have left out of all account one very important factor which contributed largely to the sense of strain and mental tension during the whole period. The Roman Question, no matter what public utterances might be made by politicians, pressed heavily on the conscience of many a worthy Italian during these years, and the explosion of delight and relief when the Lateran Treaty was signed, together with the return of so many Italian men to the sacraments, is proof enough of the way this burden was felt. In an otherwise capable book Miss Hentze seems to have overlooked this point.

A. B.

*Diplomacy and God.* By George Glasgow. (Longmans. 7s. 6d. net.)

Mr. Glasgow, who is a recent convert to the Church, has shown great courage in writing this outspoken indictment of diplomatic practice after some twenty years' experience as diplomatic correspondent of the *Observer*. He feels that "there is no excuse for the man who happens to have lived through it not to put on record what he honestly believes to be the truth about it". His main thesis is that diplomacy always assumes that there can be no remedy for war and that moral considerations in an evil world must simply be ignored. Incidentally he examines very fully the diplomatic background of the present war, with an admirable if startling frankness.

He declares openly, for instance, that the war began "for the purpose—this was the immediate fact—of preventing Germany from recapturing one of her former Baltic ports. Did it really matter to any British man, woman or child whether Danzig belonged to Germany or to Poland? . . . The true explanation, of course, was that we declared war on Germany in 1939, not for Poland's sake, but because we were again afraid of Germany. It was fear that decided our policy in 1939, as in 1914. It is often to be observed in human experience that when we cease to be guided by faith in God, our decisions are prompted by fear: and fear leads to disaster." Diplomacy, he argues, in repudiating faith in God had once more placed its faith in that "balance of power" which is always "bound to defeat its own object and to end in disaster". The Entente Cordiale, which Mr. Glasgow regards quite frankly as a fatal delusion, "must have been wrong in its origin, in its motive, in its activity".

These are highly controversial assertions, but Mr. Glasgow says fearlessly what he believes. No less provocative is his criticism of British policy in the Mediterranean (p. 176): "In the past we have spent untold millions on a Navy to keep open the lines of communication through the Mediterranean in war-time. In peace-time, of course, there is no difficulty. And in war-time, at any rate in the war that started in 1939, we have to face the glaring climax of nonsense, that our merchant ships hardly use the Mediterranean at all, but go round the Cape. O 'realism', where is thy sting?"

That "glaring" fact must indeed have struck many observers during this present year. But Mr. Glasgow does not advocate a British withdrawal from the Mediterranean, which would enable Axis powers to annex our interests there. His argument is that all "realist" diplomacy, whether British or French, German or Russian or American, is directed either towards aggrandizement or to retaining territories by force, and, being divorced from all moral guidance, it inevitably leads to war.

Yet his appeals for a real attempt at general disarmament are, for all their earnestness, the least convincing part of his book. He believes that the present war has so far eclipsed all former wars in its destruction and atrocious cruelty that the nations will at last be driven to disarm. But has the devastation and slaughter of this war in fact been greater than in the last, even among civilians, except for the relatively few places (chiefly in England and Germany and along the coast of France) where fighting has been intense and prolonged? Nor does Mr. Glasgow answer the

obvious objection that any formal agreement to abolish existing armaments or fleets cannot prevent the invention of new methods of warfare, or even the adaptation of civilian aircraft or shipping to warlike uses, as was done in Germany when she began to rearm in spite of stringent measures to keep her disarmed. He hopes so much from agreed disarmament that he even suggests that the Pope failed in courage when he omitted to include disarmament as one of his basic conditions of a lasting peace. May it not be that the Holy See regards the dream of agreed disarmament as little more than a mirage, until diplomacy accepts the moral restraints upon which Mr. Glasgow so strongly insists?

D. G.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### THE TEACHING OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY

C. writes :

I have read the article of "Paedagogus" on this subject with great interest and with profound disagreement—at least as regards the second and more "tentative" part of it. I react against the movement to substitute the teaching methods of modern non-Catholic Universities for the traditional and well-tried methods of Catholic Seminaries.

Why must we take the non-Catholic Universities and their methods always at their own valuation? I have experienced both methods, and as regards X university I can truly say that the most valuable influences from the educational point of view in my own case were not the supervisions (or tutorials), but the lectures of two or three of the more inspiring lecturers, and some of the books we were advised to read, and of course the original texts. Looking back, I seem to have derived but little inspiration from tutors. I am sure that I owe far more to my studies in the seminary than I do to my three years at X university. And I also maintain that the average seminary-trained priest in this country is a better educated man than the average graduate of our non-Catholic Universities. The seminaries do at least teach people to think clearly—and that, surely, is education.

As regards the first part of the article, about the heuristic and didactic methods of teaching, "Paedagogus" seems to me to be making a mountain out of a mole-hill; he exaggerates the situation of which he is trying to find a solution. Is it true that "seminary students often find their Dogmatic Theology the least interesting part of their work"? Personally, I think most people find Theology more interesting than Philosophy, and perhaps than Exegesis, Church History or Canon Law. I grant that in the Seminary one finds the lazy and the bored; but they are to be found also at the University, and in at least as high a proportion. And in the former case the explanation may well be a lack of vocation, and not any defect in teaching methods.

Moreover, are the methods of our modern manuals so very different from the method "Paedagogus" advocates? The manuals I have used (Van Noort and Diekamp) present their theses more or less in this order: (1) Opposing heresies. (2) Catholic doctrine or dogma. (3) Points disputed by different schools of theologians. And that seems to me an eminently rational, lucid and sensible order.

If we want to improve our methods would it not be better to go for our inspiration to *Catholic* centres such as Rome, Louvain, St. Sulpice or Maynooth?

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

great  
second  
stitute  
tradi-

thods  
and as  
from  
visions  
g lec-  
se the  
ration  
inary  
at the  
l man  
naries  
n.

dactic  
untain  
ing to  
Dog-  
ally, I  
y, and  
that in  
found  
in the  
ot any

fferent  
e used  
order:  
ts dis-  
me an  
go for  
oice or

M

2

co

de

m

lo

co

di

sa

th

m

o

an

its

o

he

ba

an

co

m

an

or

th

ty

re

w

th

fi

di

fo

th

pr

da

al

C